

**THE BOOK OF MICAH :
STUDIES IN THE TEXT, VERSIONS AND
HISTORY OF INTERPRETATION WITH SPECIAL
REFERENCE TO MICAH 4:14 - 5:5**

Anthony J. Petrotta

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of MPhil
at the
University of St Andrews



1984

Full metadata for this item is available in
St Andrews Research Repository
at:

<http://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/>

Please use this identifier to cite or link to this item:

<http://hdl.handle.net/10023/13799>

This item is protected by original copyright

The Book of Micah:
Studies in the Text, Versions, and History of Interpretation
with Special Reference to Micah 4:14-5:5

by
Anthony J. Petrotta

Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of Divinity
The University of St. Andrews
In Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Philosophy

St. Andrews, Scotland

1983



ProQuest Number: 10166275

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10166275

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

Th
A106

In submitting this thesis to the University of St. Andrews, I understand that I am giving permission for it to be made available for use in accordance with the regulations of the University Library for the time being in force, subject to any copyright vested in the work not being affected thereby. I also understand that the title and abstract will be published, and that a copy of the work may be supplied to any bonda fide library or research worker.

I certify that Anthony J. Petrotta has fulfilled the conditions of the resolution of the University Court, 1967, No. 1, and that he is qualified to submit this thesis in application for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

.
Dr. Robert B. Salters
St. Mary's College
University of St. Andrews

I hereby declare that the following thesis is based on the results of research carried out by myself, that it is my own composition, and that it has not previously been presented for a higher degree. The research was carried out at the University of St. Andrews under the supervision of Dr. Robert B. Salters.

Acknowledgements

No one completes a research project without the aid and encouragement of many people. Although I am sincerely grateful to all of them, some deserve a particular word of appreciation.

First, the staff of the University library, St. Andrews, for their professionalism and support in obtaining needed materials. Special mention must be made of Miss Morag Fowler for her numerous practical suggestions, as well as her diligence in locating books and articles. Thanks are also due to the staff of the libraries of the Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley, California, and the Mennonite Biblical Seminary, Fresno, California, for allowing me to use their facilities while I was absent from St. Andrews.

Second, the financial support of the Layne Foundation and my grandmother, Gertrude Homstad, was greatly appreciated.

Third, I am thankful for the faculty of St. Mary's College. I am especially grateful to my advisor, Dr. Robert Salters, for his patience and his judicious comments at every stage of the research.

Finally, one's family bears the burden of the countless hours spent away from their needs and desires. My love goes to my wife, Janet, and my children, Brian and Jenna.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS	viii
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 1: THE VERSIONS, DEAD SEA SCROLLS, NEW TESTAMENT, AND THE MASORETIC TEXT OF MICAH	
Introduction	4
The Septuagint	8
The Peshitta	18
The Targum	24
The Vulgate	30
The Treatment of the Palestinian Place-Names by the Versions	34
The Dead Sea Scrolls	40
The New Testament	51
Conclusions	75
CHAPTER 2: A SURVEY OF THE HISTORY OF THE INTERPRETATION OF MICAH 4:14-5:5	
Introduction	78
The Patristic Period	80
Medieval Christian Exegesis	89
Medieval Jewish Exegesis	98
The Reformation Period	106
The Post-Reformation Period	114
The Modern Period	121
Conclusions	127

CHAPTER 3: THE EXEGESIS OF MICAH 4:14-5:5	
Introduction	131
Exegesis	135
Translation	196
CHAPTER 4: ELIEZER OF BEAUGENCY	
Introduction	197
Text of the Commentary on Micah	209
Translation of the Commentary on Micah	215
FOOTNOTES	240
SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY	258

ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations used follow those listed in the "Instructions to Contributors," Society of Biblical Literature Member's Handbook (1980). References to texts, grammars, or lexicons are given either by the author's name. (i.e. "Segal" refers to M. H. Segal, A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew), or by the authors' initials (i.e. "BDB" refers to F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs, Hebrew and Lexicon of the Old Testament). These standard reference works will not be listed in the "Select Bibliography."

In addition to these, the following abbreviations are employed.

CHB, Cambridge History of the Bible, 3 vols. (ed. by P. Ackroyd, et al.) Cambridge: 1963-1970.

Chr Trad, J. Pelikan, The Christian Tradition, 3 vols. Chicago, 1971-1978.

ODC, Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church (2nd Edition; ed. by F. L. Cross and E. A. Livingstone). Oxford: 1974.

NIDCC, New International Dictionary of the Christian Church (ed. by J. Douglas). Grand Rapids: 1974.

Rest Q, Restoration Quarterly.

WDCH, Westminster Dictionary of Church History (ed. by J. Brauer), Philadelphia: 1971.

INTRODUCTION

J. T. Willis in an article entitled, "Fundamental Issues in Contemporary Micah Studies,"¹ lists three problem areas in the study of the book of Micah: first, the present arrangement of the book and the process behind it; second, the authenticity of the hope oracles; and finally, the interpretation of difficult passages. In the intervening years, five major commentaries have appeared on Micah,² yet the situation remains essentially the same.³

The present thesis grew out of an investigation of the interpretation of the difficult passages in Micah. Willis identifies these passages as Mic 1:10-16; 2:6-11; 4:11-13; 4:14-5:5; 6:1-8; 7:7-20 (p. 77). Since space would not permit a thorough investigation of the history of the interpretation of all the difficult passages, Mic 4:14-5:5 was chosen because of the interesting exegetical problems it presents (see pp. 131-134).

Part I is an examination of the versions, Qumran Literature, and the NT use of passages from Micah. The translations of the four principal versions--the Septuagint, Targum, Peshitta, and Vulgate--are examined to establish their characteristics and translation techniques. Next, the texts from the Dead Sea are examined as yet another witness to the Hebrew text of Micah. Finally, the NT citation of OT texts is also examined as important witnesses to the state of the Hebrew text centuries earlier than the extant manuscripts of the OT. The examination of the NT texts also includes allusions to texts or themes in Micah, since these too provide information regarding the text as well as its interpretation in the early Christian community. In all this, it was found that the MT of Micah, admittedly

difficult in parts, is the best approach to understanding the text of Micah. The Versions derive from a Hebrew text of essentially the same character as the MT, and, with few exceptions, represent a less satisfactory sense than the MT when there is a divergence from the MT.

Part II is a survey of the history of the interpretation of Mic 4:14-5:5. The history of exegesis provides a thorough background to the problems involved in the passage and solutions proposed. Rather than limiting our investigation to modern critical exegesis, the major commentaries from all periods, as well as from a broad theological spectrum, are investigated in order to provide a fully informed position from which responsible exegesis could be undertaken. One of the more interesting and important points to emerge from the study is that in the pre-critical commentaries, the tensions within the pericope (which modern scholars attribute to different hands at work on the text) are often felt as keenly as in the modern commentaries. However, pre-critical commentators seek solutions to these tensions through a wide variety of literary and exegetical solutions, rather than atomizing the passage into different periods of composition. Thus, both critical and pre-critical exegesis provide valuable insights into how the text came to be and how to understand it in its present form. The history of exegesis also raises the issue of the "literal sense" of a passage. It was found that the understanding of the "literal sense" was inconstant, whether between periods (e.g. the Post-Reformation and the Modern), or even within a period (e.g. between Antiochene and Alexandrian exegesis). Careful attention to the text was always the constitutive element, but this never worked independently of broader philosophical and theological constituents.

Part III is an exegesis of Mic 4:14-5:5. It is suggested that the core of the pericope comes from Micah (4:14 in particular) to which a later editor, someone firmly rooted in both Micah and Isaianic traditions, has added material in order to cast the oracle into a

messianic prophecy (5:2 in particular). Mic 5:4 and 5 have been edited (perhaps from a pre-exilic "hope" oracle) and attached to the preceding verses by an exilic or post-exilic redactor to strengthen the messianic expectation.

Part IV is a translation of the commentary by Eliezer of Beaugency on Micah. Eliezer comes at the end of the medieval Jewish exegetical activity, and the commentary proves to have a number of interesting interpretations which are not present in the other commentaries of this important period. For example, Eliezer interprets כְּתִיבָהּ to mean "cutting oneself" as in Deut. 14:1 and similar passages. The Targum, Rashi, Ibn Ezra, and Kimchi are unanimous in taking this to mean "assemble together in troops." Thus Eliezer, together with Jerome, becomes an important witness to the meaning of "cutting oneself" over against the interpretation of the Targumist. The translation of this commentary was seen to be a fitting conclusion to the thesis.

All references to biblical texts follow the MT; any reference in parentheses is to English, Greek, etc. verses where they differ from the MT. Words or phrases in Syriac are typed in Aramaic characters. Full bibliographic information is given in a footnote the first time a work is cited. Subsequent references to the work will appear in the body of the text by name and page number. If an author has two or more works cited, a word from the title will be included so confusion does not arise. For example, R. Gundry's commentary on Matthew will be cited as, "Gundry, Commentary," while his earlier work, The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel, will be cited as, "Gundry, Use."

CHAPTER ONE

THE VERSIONS, DEAD SEA SCROLLS, NEW TESTAMENT AND THE MASORETIC TEXT OF MICAH

INTRODUCTION

Textual criticism, one of the oldest critical investigations of Scripture, is the starting place for any exegetical undertaking.¹ With the fortuitous discovery of biblical manuscripts in the Judean Desert, textual criticism was given new impetus both in terms of what it was able to achieve and in terms of scholarly attention. Notwithstanding the perdurability of textual criticism and the renewed interest, fundamental problems still persist. Indeed, the title of B. J. Roberts' recent essay, "The Textual Transmission of the Old Testament," indicates the extent that these persistent problems have changed the way some view the task of textual criticism.²

Following the plethoric activity generated by the Dead Sea Scrolls, S. Talmon³ raised one of the first flags signalling that all was not well in the fortress of textual criticism. His express concern was to show new directions that textual criticism could take "in direct conjunction with the wider realm of biblical studies" (p. 321). He argued that the "creative impulse" did not end with the authoring of a biblical text, but overlapped with the history of the transmission of a text. Once this is accepted, the separation between "lower" and "higher" criticism is less distinct, and new ground can be broken in interdisciplinary research.

M. Greenberg's essay, "The Use of the Ancient Versions for Interpreting the Hebrew Text,"⁴ is a fine example of using textual criticism in the exegetical task. His essay includes a comprehensive treatment of a single pericope, as well as outlining theoretical implications and practical guidelines. The proper role of textual criticism in the exegetical task, Greenberg argues, is working out the meaning of a particular text, not with reconstructing a hypothetical one. Thus when one carries over the meaning of the divergencies between texts, rather than jumping immediately to the question of which reading is "original," unexpected insights may follow. As Greenberg sums up his own study: "We have tried to show through study of two examples that divergencies between MT and G in Ezekiel (and by implication elsewhere) may constitute alternative messages, each with its own validity. Exegetical rewards came, in each case, by asking not which reading was the original one, but what effect did the divergence work on the messages of the respective versions" (p. 140).

Finally, J. Sanders' Presidential address for the Society of Biblical Literature, "Text and Canon: Concepts and Method," gives a survey of issues in textual criticism against the backdrop of two major projects on the Hebrew text: the Hebrew University Bible Project and the United Bible Societies Hebrew Old Testament Text Critical Project. He appeals for a pluralistic view of the canon and an appreciation for the pluralistic texts that functioned authoritatively in the varied believing communities. This appeal is not only a way for understanding the text, but also for understanding our place in the stream of hermeneutical tradition (Sanders, pp. 26-29). He states, "There is no early biblical manuscript of which I am aware no matter how 'accurate' we may

conjecture it to be, or faithful to its Vorlage, that does not have some trace in it of its having been adapted to the needs of the community from which we, by archaeology or happenstance, receive it. Such observations are relative and pertain not to method in text criticism, but to the concepts on which method is based" (p. 13, italics added).

Thus a pluralistic view of the texts (especially in the early period), the recognition of the on-going creative impulse of scribes and translators, and the authoritative role a text or translation plays in the community are relevant factors in how we view the task of textual criticism. Moreover, it is by tarrying over the texts with these observations in mind that exegetical insights emerge.

We begin our study of Micah with an investigation of the four principal versions:⁵ Septuagint, Peshitta, Targum, and Vulgate. When one considers that the standard critical editions of the OT, Biblia Hebraica (3rd. Edition) and, more recently, Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia, are based upon codices of the ben Asher family--Leningrad, Aleppo, and, on the Prophets, a Qaraite manuscript from Cairo--which date to the end of the first millennium, these early translations, though in themselves difficult to date, become important witnesses to a text or textual tradition that may antedate the textual tradition of the MT.

The first step in assessing the relationship between the MT and the versions is to try to ascertain the text which underlies the version--the Vorlage. This raises problems in itself; "There is no retroversion without a residue of doubt, and what seems self-evident to one scholar may look like a house of cards to his fellow."⁶ Thus there is no claim that the Vorlagen proposed are

incontestable. Rather, they are suggestions of what seems most likely in the present state of our knowledge.

Once the Vorlagen of a particular version are reconstructed, they must be seen in the light of the MT. The MT is the vehicle for reconstructing and understanding the text; as Greenberg states, "Only through it [i.e., the MT] can sound exegesis, interpreting the Hebrew by the Hebrew, be achieved" (p. 147). One must focus on the MT; any discrepancy between it and the Vorlage of a version calls for comment. If the MT is obviously corrupt, the reconstructed Vorlage serves as a basis for emendation. However, even if the MT is sound, the divergence still calls for explanation. It then adds to our knowledge of the nature of the early texts and the translation techniques employed.

It follows from this that the exegete must be predisposed to the hypothesis that "every element in his text has significance" (Greenberg, p. 147). Every translation involves interpretation; "For interpretation is no more than the effort to assign meaning to a message."⁷ Thus a divergence is not seen first and foremost as a means to supplant the MT, but is seen in the context of its own literary and sociological milieu. Correlation and contrast both illumine the text--but only if one does not resort prematurely to text alterations. Each divergence affects the message, and this must be assessed before the final question can be answered of which reading is the "best."

When evaluating the versions against the MT, it is not enough simply to count the number of versions for or against a particular reading.⁸ When readings from the "Christian" versions (LXX, P, or V) agree against the MT, it may only reflect one reading against another (cf. Roberts "Transmission," pp. 24 and 29). Thus again,

only when the significance of the variants in the versions is assessed can the "best" reading be suggested.

The "best" text, as Greenberg suggests for a working definition, is that text by which the other can be most easily explained: "If the critic can identify (or reconstruct) the reading from which the variant(s) in the other witness(es) can be derived, and if he can indicate how the variant(s) came into being according to the documented ways in which texts become corrupted or altered, he will have established the best reading that the extant witnesses make available" (Greenberg, p. 148). The task is to establish the best text and thus no attempt is made to recover a "lost original." If one text cannot be explained in terms of another, then the exegete has reached the limits of his inquiry.⁹ The focus then shifts to the plurality of texts and their authoritative roles within the particular community.

In this initial investigation we will not, however, seek to establish the "best" text of Micah; rather we seek only to identify the general characteristics and translation techniques of the versions, and whether, on the whole, the particular version represents a consonantal text different from the consonantal text of the MT. In the exegesis of Mic 4:14-5:5 we will seek to establish the "best" text of that pericope.

THE SEPTUAGINT

Tradition links the best known of the ancient versions to an Alexandrian community during the third century b.c. It has long been recognized that the Letter of Aristeas is apocryphal in nature and probably arose as an apologia for the new translation from the Sacred Tongue.¹⁰ Nevertheless, it is generally agreed that elements in the story can be accepted as reflecting the origin of the

translation; the Septuagint, or at least the translation of the Pentateuch, arose in a Greek-speaking Jewish community in Alexandria during the third century B.C. The LXX is not a single translation, as tradition would have it, but many translations, as can be seen by the diverse ways in which the books are translated, and even the disparity within a particular book (e.g. Jeremiah). In Thackeray's study of the LXX of the prophetic books, he failed to detect more than one translator in the Minor Prophets.¹¹

The translation of the Pentateuch into Greek was "totally without precedent in the Hellenistic world,"¹² because there were no direct models to emulate or examine. Bickerman points out that there were dragomen in the ancient Near East; however, the LXX was unique in that it was a public document.¹³ Thus while the translator(s) of the Pentateuch had only "rudimentary equivalents" (Bickerman, p. 180), the translator of Micah had at least the LXX of the Pentateuch for his model. But does the translator exhibit any sense of having learned from his model? Roberts suggests, as a rough classification that, "on the whole the translation tends to deteriorate the farther it is from the Pentateuch" (OT Text, p. 181).¹⁴ When classifying Micah specifically, Roberts suggests that the LXX can be of "considerable" help in restoring the Hebrew text (OT Text, p. 187). Similarly, R. Meyer states that the MT is in worse condition (schlechter) than the former Vorlage of the LXX.¹⁵ However, Rudolph says that the LXX "Bietet der textkritik bedauerlich wenig Hilfe" (p. 26), and appeals to it only six times for emendation.

Two studies specifically related to the LXX of Micah should be mentioned. First, M. Collin¹⁶ argues on the basis of a comparison between selected passages of the MT, the LXX, and the Qumran texts of Micah that the MT and the LXX each represent two different

textual traditions. Aq acts as a bridge between the two recensions. Mur. 88 follows the tradition of the MT, but 1QpMic and 4QpMic may represent yet a third textual tradition. However, two questions arise from this study. First, one must question how much F. M. Cross' local-text theory influences the conclusions of this study. There is always a tension between the theories and presuppositions one brings to a text and what the text itself will support. In this case, it appears that, in the interest of carrying forward a promising theory, the theory has unduly influenced the results. This will become more clear after our own study of the LXX, but when Collin says that the LXX translation of Mic 1:10-16 represents both a clear and coherent translation and a different textual tradition from the MT, and another scholar concludes that the LXX of this passage is an inferior translation of a text essentially the same as the MT,¹⁷ then something is amiss and some comment is in order.

Of greater importance, however, is the fact that Collin only examines two pericopes: Mic 1:10-16 and Mic 2:6-13. One must question whether this is an adequate representation to draw the conclusions Collin wishes to draw. No real attempt is made to classify or come to terms with how and why these divergencies exist between the LXX and the MT. For example, at 1:10 Collin observes that the LXX corresponds to לִגְלִי over against MT, לִגְלִי. He says that it is likely the lamed dropped out of the MT (why?), and that this represents two different traditions. Collin notes that Aq supports the MT, but fails to note that Sym, V, and Tg also support it. P's translation corresponds to לִגְלִי. Thus, the text is more complex than Collin would lead us to believe. The verb μεγαλύνει translates the root גָּדַל at Mic 5:3 (5:4) and elsewhere in the Minor Prophets (e.g. Amos 8:5; Joel 2:20; etc.).

Also notice the influence from 2 Sam 1:20, "Tell it not in Gath (לֹא-תִגִּידוּ בַגַּת) ...lest the daughters of the Philistines rejoice" (תִּדְמַחְנָה): The exultation of the Philistines over Israel's distress is portrayed in this dirge over Saul's death. Observe also Obad 12, "...And you should not have rejoiced (תִּדְמַחְנָה) over the people of Judah...you should not have boasted (לֹא-תִגִּידוּ) in the day of distress." The verb לִגְלוֹ is translated in LXX by μεγαλορρημονήσης which is used elsewhere for the hiph'il of לָגַל (e.g. Judg 6:17; Ps 35:26 [34:20]; Ezek 35:13). Furthermore, there is the possibility that the text has been damaged or miscopied and the LXX represents a conflation of the original text with either an alternative or erroneous reading (see Melamed below). To state simply that the readings represent two texts, or that a lamed has dropped from the MT appears to be an oversimplification of the problem. The problem is more complex and may involve influences from other texts, a damaged text or alternative reading, a reconstruction ad sensum, etc. The question of which reading is the "best" yet remains. The conclusion one draws is necessarily tied to the broader issue of the characteristics of the LXX or MT, as well as an exegesis of the passage as a whole. If the MT of Micah, or even of this particular passage, were characteristically corrupt, then the LXX reading might be favoured. If the author were making a conscious effort to make allusion to the passage in 2 Sam 1:20, then the MT might be favoured. At any rate, Collin's study appears to be too narrowly represented and does not take sufficient cognizance of the complexity of a particular reading.

The second study is by E. Z. Melamed.¹⁸ His study is marked by a detailed and comprehensive examination of the whole text of Micah. He notes that the LXX of the Bible is not the work of one

hand and was not translated at one time; the translation grew and thus the lexical stock of the translators changed. He then classifies the many divergencies between the LXX and the MT, and offers brief comments and parallel passages to account for these. He concludes that a great many words and expressions are changed because of the imprecision of readings, difficult forms, influences from other passages, and so forth. Thus Melamed explains the LXX in the light of the MT, and concludes that on the whole the LXX is an inferior translation, not a different textual tradition.

One could question, however, whether Melamed's view of the MT unduly influences his conclusions. He nowhere states what authority he accords the MT, but in his study the MT holds the central position. Since he gives a detailed account before he draws his conclusion, it is easily checked by examining the various classifications and explanations. Using 1:10 as an example, Melamed argues that the reading which was before P, וַיִּגְדֵּל, was also before the translator of the LXX. A proof-reader added a daleth above the word and the translator (or copyist before him) attached it to the word and read וַיִּגְדֵּל. Melamed still does not address the possibility of influences from other passages; nevertheless, he gives an explanation that could account for all the readings (cf. Greenberg's assertion that the best reading is the reading by which the others can be explained).

This disparity of opinion concerning the LXX reflects the complexity of evaluating it as a translation. Undoubtedly basic attitudes towards the MT, the LXX, and the other versions influence, to a greater or lesser degree, the conclusions one will draw from these texts. Nevertheless, it is only through this constant dialogue between a text and scholars that the problems are clarified and solutions can be adequately evaluated.

THE SEPTUAGINT OF MICAH

Mic 1:1 serves as a convenient starting place for discussing the characteristics of the versions on Micah. The LXX commences with a formulaic "And the Word of the Lord came..." which appears to be influenced by other introductory formulas. The LXX of Jonah 1:1 and Mic 1:1 read the same, but the Hebrew of Jonah 1:1 reads וַיְהִי דְבַר-יְהוָה . Hos 1:1 and Zeph 1:1 are similar to Mic 1:1 by having אֲשֶׁר הִיָּה אֵל but read ὃς ἐγέννηθ'ν πρὸς in the LXX. The LXX of Amos 1:1 mistakenly understands אֲשֶׁר הִיָּה to refer to the "words of Amos" and treats בִּנְקָדִים as a place-name, "In Nakkarim" (notice also the confusion between daleth and resh!). Finally, Zech 1:1, which has הִיָּה דְבַר-יְהוָה אֵל , reads ἐγένετο λόγος κυρίου πρὸς in the LXX (cf. Hag 1:1). Syh, Theophylakt, and the LXX translation in Jerome's commentary conform to the MT of Mic 1:1, as do V, P, and Tg. No clear pattern emerges in these formulas, though the other introductions follow the word order of the MT.

What suggests either influence from other introductory formulas or simply a misunderstanding of Hebrew, is the LXX translation of "the Morashtite." The LXX understands the title as a patronymic reference, "the son of Morashti." Hos 1:1; Joel 1:1; Jonah 1:1; Zeph 1:1; and Zech 1:1 have τὸν τοῦ for MT -בֶּן . At Hag 1:1 for חֲגִי הַנְּבִיא , which most closely resembles מִיכָה הַמֹּרַשְׁתִּי LXX has Ἀγγέλου τοῦ προφήτου . Furthermore, the translator does not appear to be familiar with Jer 33:18 (LXX), which reads Μιχαῖας ὁ Μωραθίτης .

The initial words of Mic 1:1 thus suggest influence from other books of the Minor Prophets, and alert us to the possibility that the translator's knowledge of Hebrew idiom and perhaps even Palestinian geography is questionable. There is also the possibility that the translator's text is slightly damaged; or that, since

Mic 1:1 is the work of an editor, the text was still fluid at the time of the translation. However, none of the other versions support this, and the LXX translation is not an improvement on the MT.¹⁹

The remainder of the translation of Mic 1:1 is straightforward. Observe, however, the avoidance of asyndeton by the insertion of the conjunction before the names of the Judaeian kings, and the insertion of *περί* before "Jerusalem."

Although the translation of Mic 1:1 does not altogether indicate it, the translator takes noticeable care to render his Vorlage literally. For example, in Mic 1:3, *כי הנה יהוה* is rendered as *ὁ κύριος ἰδοὺ*. For the participle *יצא*, the translator employs *ἐκπορεύεται*. *Ἐκ τοῦ τόπου αὐτοῦ* corresponds to *ממקומו*. The verbs *וירד ודרך* are translated by *καταβήσεται* and *ἐπιβήσεται*. Finally, *על במותי ארץ* is rendered as *ἐπὶ τὰ ὄψη τῆς γῆς*.

Even when the translator appears to be hopelessly lost, as in 7:4, he still follows the word order as reflected in the MT. First, the initial words of 7:4 are taken as the predicate of the final verb in 7:3; "They will take away their good things" (MT *סובם* is rendered as "the best of them" by RSV). Next, the translator mistakenly read *חרק* for *חורק* and adds "moth," "as a moth devours and advances" (*ישר* is either read as a participle, or from the root *שור*). RSV translates the Hebrew as , "like a brier, the most upright of them a thorn hedge." The LXX takes *מצפיק* (RSV, "watchman") as a noun *ἡμερησία*, "in the day of waiting" (or "look-out place"²⁰), and connects it with the preceding (*contra* RSV). The LXX implies the same consonantal text and word order as the MT, although the vocalization and sentence division differ considerably. Taylor says

that the LXX is "so forced and unnatural that we are compelled to decide against [it]" (p. 165).

That the sentence division and vocalizaion differ from the MT is not unusual in the LXX of Micah, and should come as no surprise since the MT came nearly a millennium later than the translation of the LXX. For example, at 5:3 (5:4), the waw is omitted before וישבן (perhaps through haplography with אלהיו) and the sentence is rendered by the LXX, "In the glory of the name of the Lord their [notice the pl. suf. for the sg. of the MT; this conforms to the pl. verbs] God they shall dwell." At 1:10 the final words continue into 1:11; "According to your laughter you shall sprinkle yourself with dust." Examples of different vocalizations can be found at 1:11 where the LXX reads "her cities" (עריה) for "nakedness" (עריה); and at 2:7 for האמור, the LXX reads ἡ ἀμὼρ, ὁ λέγων.

Mic 7:4 further indicates that although the translator struggles to follow the consonantal text and word order of the Hebrew, he nevertheless must supply missing elements or reconstruct ad sensum. For example, at 2:4 after κατεμετρήθη, "have been measured" (MT ימירו), the translator adds "with a line" (cf. 2:5 משליך חבל). Also, at 1:11 after the translator has mistakenly taken האצל as a noun and not a place-name, he adds αὐτῆς to smooth out the translation. Thus, although the translator endeavors to be literal and follow the word order of his Vorlage, he will, on occasion, add an appropriate predicate, or additional words where the sense warrants it.

The example of 2:4 above and the discussion of 1:1 indicate that the translator may be influenced by other verses or biblical passages. In 1:6, the translator renders לעי השדה as εἰς ὄπωραφυλάκιον ἀργοῦ, "into a hut of a field." Isa 1:8 reads

"And the Daughter of Zion is left like a booth of a vineyard, like a lodge (MT, כמלונה , LXX ὀπωραφυλάκιον) in a cucumber field." Similarly, cf. 5.4 (5:5), "your land" (MT, "our land"), with Isa 1:7, "Your country lies desolate..." (cf. p. 185). Within the book of Micah itself, compare the rendering of הנשכים , τούς δάκνοντας, with 5.4 (5:5) נסיכי , which is rendered as δῆγματα (reading shin for samekh).

In contrast to these instances where there is an apparent influence from other passages, the translation shows a lack of influence, especially from the LXX of other books. For example, at 3:1 and 3:9 קציני בית ישראל , "leaders of the house of Israel" is rendered as οἱ κατάλοιποι οἴκου Ἰσραήλ , "the remnant of the house of Israel." Elsewhere in Micah κατάλοιπος translates שארית (cf. 2:12; 7:18). At Isa 1:10 קציני is correctly translated as ἄρχοντες . At 2:1 the idiom, כי יש לאל ידם , "for it is in the power of their hand" is rendered, "for they do not raise their hands to God." In the LXX of Gen 31:29 and Deut 28:32 the idiom is correctly translated as, "Now as my hand has power...." This apparent unfamiliarity with the LXX translations of other books also manifests itself in the way the translator treats the place-names in Micah. For example, at 6:5 "Shittim" is rendered by τῶν σχοίνων , whereas in the LXX of Num and Josh it is correctly Σάτιν (or the like). Observe that at Joel 4:18 (3:18) Shittim is similarly translated as τῶν σχοίνων (cf. p. 38).

We have argued that the translator apparently misunderstood some words in the text (1:1, 2:1, 3:9, etc.). He also appears to translate less familiar words with better known words. For example, at 2:8, LXX renders שלמה , "robe," as εἰρηνη , "peace." Similarly, at 7:3 for בְּשִׁלָּה , the LXX has εἰρηνικός . Perhaps the Vorlage was read as בְּשִׁלָּה ; however, the possibility exists that the translator is simply predisposed to translating שלם as "peace"

because he is not familiar with the less common homographs. These verses in Micah support this since 2:8 and 7:3 represent different meanings of the root שלם, and, more importantly, "peace" is inappropriate in both instances and thus represents an inferior reading. Both Tg and V support reading two kinds of cloaks at 2:8 (P follows the LXX by reading "peace"). Similarly, at 7:3 the other versions support reading "bribe" for בשלום. For the figurative use of שטן throughout Mic 2:1-11, the translator was content to render it literally employing the verb, δακρύνειν, "weep." Like "peace" in 2:8 and 7:3, "to weep" in 2:1-11 is inappropriate. Finally, at 1:11 for the difficult בשה עריו, "in nakedness and shame," the translator reads עריו, τὰς πόλεις αὐτῆς, and omits בשה altogether.

The multifarious divergencies from the MT do not indicate a consistent or conscious effort to transform or paraphrase the text, as the translator of the Targum so frequently does. However, at 4:5 and 6 there appears to be a deliberate change of the text on the part of the translator for theological purposes. At 4:5, "For all the peoples walk each in the name of its god," is rendered by the translator as "because all the peoples will walk each in his own way." At 4:6, "And those whom I have afflicted," is rendered as, "And those whom I have drove away." This is the only place where the verb ἀπωθεῖν translates the root גרע. The other divergencies do not reflect this conscious effort to transform a word or verse and result, more often than not, in a reading inferior to that of the MT (cf., for example, Taylor's remarks on 1:1, 4:5-7; or 7:4).

In conclusion, these few examples indicate the complexity of the LXX translation of Micah. On occasion he is woodenly literal, yet

he will add words if necessary and often deviates from the MT, whether through ignorance or error. The translator appears to be influenced by other passages, yet shows a surprising lack of knowledge of the LXX of other passages that could have aided his translation. In all this, however, the consonantal text of the MT appears to be the best explanation of the many divergencies; and yet precisely because there are so many divergencies, an explanation is required. There is the possibility that the Vorlage of the LXX represents a different text-type or recension. In most of the divergencies we argued, however, that the LXX was inferior to the MT. If it is indeed a different, yet inferior, recension, it is of marginal help in unravelling the difficulties of the text of Micah. The translator appears to lack a depth of knowledge of the Hebrew language (e.g. the rendering of "Morashtite" in 1:1; "leaders" in 3:1 and 9, etc.). Melamed suggests that the translator spoke Aramaic, and that recourse to the Aramaic can help explain some divergencies between the LXX and the MT (p. 105). There is also the possibility of a damaged or indistinct text that the translator utilized.

Whether the Vorlage of the LXX is different or damaged, or whether the translator himself lacked sufficient knowledge or resources for the undertaking, as a general principle the MT remains a better guide for understanding the book of Micah, and any appeal to the LXX for emendation should be made with caution.

THE PESHITTA

The name Peshitta, i.e., "The Simple (Version)," derives either from the simplicity of the translation (the vernacular language is employed), or from the antithesis to the Syro-hexaplaric and later periphrastic translations of the OT²¹.

Fixing a date, authorship, or even a text of P is complicated by the turbulent history of the Syrian church itself. When Nestorius, Bishop of Constantinople, was expelled from his post early in the fifth century, Syrian Christianity was left with a great schism. The different recensions--Nestorian, Jacobite, Melchite--arose out of this division. Further complications arose from P's contact with other versions, particularly the LXX, and, because of its proximity to Palestine and the likelihood of Jewish converts within the church, the Targum.

The origin of P is likewise obscure; is it Jewish, Christian, or Jewish-Christian?²² The complex history of the text makes the question of origin all but unanswerable. With the recent appearance of a critical edition of P, scholars at last have a stronger basis for evaluation.²³ Whether a reading is original or whether it reflects a later influence of inner corruption is still difficult to determine.

Roberts and Vööbus²⁴ characterize the translation of P on the Minor Prophets as somewhat free. Sebök is more precise when he says that the translator endeavoured to render his Vorlage faithfully, but was not unduly concerned with being exact to the letter (p. 8).

THE PESHITTA OF MICAH

P of Mic 1:1 gives an indication of the freedom the translator took with the Hebrew text as well as his faithfulness to it. On this verse the translator follows the Hebrew word order but employs the syntax of Syriac (the pron. suf. on "word" in conjunction with the rel. pron. to form the genitive relation) and supplies the preposition "concerning" before both Samaria and Jerusalem (whereas MT has the preposition only before Samaria). However, the translation itself conveys the sense of the Hebrew with no expansions (cf. Tg) or misunderstandings (cf. LXX).

In addition to employing Syriac grammatical constructions where they might differ from Hebrew ones, the translator also, on occasion, will alter the word order or change the person or number of a verb or noun. For example, in 1:2 for **עמים כלם**, P has **כלכון עממא** (cf. also the 2nd per. suf.) and for **אדני יהוה בכם**, the translator has **בכון מרא מרווא סהדא**. These transpositions may result from the translator emphasizing certain words, as perhaps in 1:5 where "all of this" precedes "the transgressions of Jacob;" or perhaps because in Syriac the normal word order requires the reversal, as in 2:12 where "all of you" precedes "Jacob," just as in 1:2 as noted above. Nevertheless, these transpositions are characteristic of the translation as a whole.

The translator also takes liberty to change the person or number of a verb or noun. As was noted above concerning 1:2, "all of them" has been changed to "all of you." Since the imperative is employed, the context suggests that this change is appropriate; however, there is little doubt that the MT is the reading the translator had before him. The translator also changes a verb if the context suggests such a change; for example, at 7:19 the MT has 3rd. pers. sg. verbs but then changes to the 2nd. pers. sg., "thou wilt cast." The translator of P continues with the 3rd. pers. throughout the verse; "He will turn and have mercy on us; he will gather all our iniquity and cast all of our sins into the depths of the sea." The translator also changes a noun from sg. to pl. or vice versa. For example, at 3:10 the MT has **בדמיט**, whereas P has **בדמא**; or at 5:11 (5:12) where P has **מן אידיך** for **מידך** (cf. 5:12 [5:13] where MT has the pl. **ידיך**). These examples suggest that the translator takes liberty with his text with regard to the person or number of a verb or noun in order to make his text more consistent between antecedents and subjects and the like. These changes are

common in the versions as a whole, and need not suggest a different Vorlage or text-type.

Obvious scribal corruptions such as confusion of letters, dittography, haplography, and so forth, are difficult to identify in P. At 1:11 P has עבדי, whereas MT has עברי; an obvious confusion between daleth and resh. At 1:15 לעלם is often taken as a scribal mistake (Sebök, Taylor). However, notice that "he shall come" is translated by "he shall exalt" (נעלא), and thus the place name would be inappropriate, and the change to "forever" (omission of the daleth) may be more deliberate. Conscious or deliberate changes account for the greater part of the divergencies between the MT and P. For example, at 7:19 the MT reads, "he will tread (ינבש) our iniquities" preceding "thou will cast all our sins into the depths of the sea," whereas P translates this as, "he will gather (ונכנוש) our iniquity and cast our sin...." God first "gathers" the sins and then "casts" them into the sea.²⁵

These suggest that what at first looks like an obvious scribal mistake may, on closer inspection, reflect a conscious transformation or ad sensum rendering of a word or phrase by the translator.

In addition to deliberate changes, other divergencies from the MT can be accounted for by influence from either the LXX or Tg. At 7:3 for the hapax legomenon ויעבנהוה, P reads ואסליה with Tg's דקלקל. Tg appears to be reading העב for the more difficult עבה. Similarly, at 4:8 P, with the other versions, reads אפל where MT has עפל. The LXX exerts the most influence on P. For example, at 7:4 P reads, "they have become like rags which are eaten by a moth." The MT has "the best of them is like a brier (חדק), the most upright of them a thorn hedge" (RSV). The LXX mistakenly translates the Hebrew as, "As a moth [added to the text] devours (חרק) and advances (ישו)" (cf. p. 14). Similarly, at 1:10 P reads החדון (Hebrew, הגילו),

"rejoice," for MT רגלו (cf. LXX, μεγαλύνεσθε, and 2 Sam 1:20).

The last example also shows the possibility of influence from other biblical passages. The most obvious example of this is at 4:1-4 where influence can be detected from P's translation of Isa 2:2-4. At 4:1 the translator adds, "all of them" to "peoples" who flow to Mt. Zion. Isa 2:2 reads, "And all the nations shall flow to it." Also at 4:3 P omits "many" before "people," as in Isa 2:4; notice also that the translator of Isa 2:4 adds "afar," which is not in the Isaiah passage but is in Mic 4:3. There also appears to be influence from Num 34:7, "From the Great Sea you shall mark out your line to Mount Hor," on Mic 7:12 where P has "Mount Hor" for MT וְהָר הָהָר.

Divergencies from the MT which appear to be influenced by other versions display themselves in additions or in changes to the person or number of a verb or noun. For example, at 3:1 P adds "These (things)" after the imperative "hear," and LXX has ἀκούσατε δὴ ταῦτα. At 4:12 P has the sg., "the thought of the Lord," for MT, מחשבות יהוה, and LXX, τὸν λογισμόν κυρίου. Note also that at 5:1 both P and V have the sg., "whose origin" for MT, מִיָּחָד. It is not always possible to say whether the translator himself introduced these divergencies or whether his Vorlage already had them. "Whose origin" in 5:1 would appear to be a different Vorlage since both P and V have this divergence and neither version shows influence on the other in other passages. However, this is mitigated by the christological importance of the verse; Christ's "origin" is from the Father.

Where the LXX unequivocally alters the text for theological reasons (viz., at 4:5), however, P is content to render the Hebrew quite literally, "For all the people will walk every one in the name of his God, and we will walk in the name of the Lord our God." Cf. LXX, "For all the people will walk each in his own way...."

The theological or ad sensum rendering of a word or verse

comes from apparent influence of Tg's tradition on P. At 6:3 Tg and P agree in rendering **בי ענה** by **אסתיך** (RSV, "answer me"). At 2:3 for MT, **משפחה**, P and Tg have "generation," **שברוא**. Also at 2:3 for "you shall not walk haughtily," P has **לא ונהלכון בקהמנא פשיטנא** and Tg has **ולא ונהכון בקומא זקופא**.

M. L. Klein has called attention to "converse translation" as a translation technique used by Tg.²⁶ We can detect influence on P from Tg where P also employs this technique. At 7:18 the rhetorical question, "Who is a God like thee," is rendered by Tg as, "There is no God like thee," which P apparently follows, **לית אלהא אכונך**. At 5:5 (5:6) P and Tg insert a negative particle before "he shall come into our land...." More subtly, at 4:14 (5:1) where Tg turns the derogatory statement, "Cut yourself; O daughter of marauders" into an exhortation, "Band together in camps, O town," P has, "Now you shall go forth in a raid, O daughter of mighty raiders."

P can also use this technique independently of Tg. At 6:7 P again translates a rhetorical question, "Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams..." as a negative statement and a conditional clause, "The Lord will not be pleased with thousands of rams, nor with ten thousands of heifers; if I should offer my first-born it is a transgression for me, and the fruit of my body, it is a sin against my soul." Perhaps the change at 7:19, **יכנוש** for MT **יכבש**, also represents a contradictory translation. This, however, is not as certain as the other examples.

P uses circumlocutions like Tg where MT has "Yahweh" following the object marker **אח**. For example, at 5:6 for **כטל מאח יהוה**, P has **אין טלא מן קדם מריא** (cf. 1:12). Notice also 2:1 where P has the explanatory gloss, "practice what they devised" (**דאנחשבה**) for MT **יעשוה**. (Cf. also the misunderstanding of **יש** and the possible

influence from the LXX in P's translation of the final stichos of 2:1, "They lift up יִשְׁקָלֵי] to God." The word used for יָשׁ is the same word P uses in 2:4 to translate יִשְׁאָ .)

Thus the translation of P on Micah is very complex. The burden of proof must rest with the one who argues that P's Vorlage represents a text other than the consonantal text of the MT. We have seen that there are competing influences from othe versions on the translator as well as the translator himself attempting to render a word or phrse ad sensum (cf. also P's translation of בְּפִי חִיָּה at 5:4; cf. p. 192). Yet the concern of the translator is to be faithful to his Vorlage; cf. the treatment of 4:5 against both the LXX and Tg.

THE TARGUM

"And they read from the book, from the law of God, with interpretations; and they gave the sense, so that the people understood the reading" (Neh 8:8). This tradition ascribed to the post-exilic community illustrates the need for translations and explanations of Scripture once Hebrew ceased to be the common speech of the diaspora and post-exilic communities.

The Babylonian Talmud preserves this tradition concerning the authorship of the Targum (Meg. 3a): "The Targum of the Prophets was composed by Jonathan ben Uzziel under the guidance of Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, and the land of Israel (thereupon) quaked...."²⁷ The name Jonathan (and Onkelos) is identified, erroneously, with the Greek translator Theodotian (and Aquila). The contact by Jonathan with the post-exilic prophets Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi probably refers to oral tradition handed down since they are separated by centuries in time.²⁸ Irrespective of any kernel of truth that underlies this tradition, the final shaping of the Targum took place in

Babylon, and thus, as with the other ancient versions, our text reflects a long history of transmission and redaction.²⁹

A midrashic method of exegesis characterizes the translation of the Targum; there may be a paraphrase, an explanation, or even a brief story that illustrates its meaning. Moreover, the Targum, more overtly than the other versions, reflects certain theological biases. This is especially noticeable in its rendering of the Tetragrammaton and the avoidance of anthropomorphisms and anthropopathisms. It also displays itself in other theological concerns. For example, the Targum consistently differentiates between the holy and the profane; a false prophet, called simply נביא in the MT, is rendered in the Targum by נביי שקרא (Mic 3:5). Worshipful veneration of the Torah and the "House of the Lord" is another concern; cf. Mic 5:14 where the wrath of God is poured out not simply on those who "have not obeyed" (MT), but on those who have not obeyed "the teaching of the Torah" (Tg). Finally, messianic hope and eschatology play a prominent role in the theology of the Targum; e.g., the "ruler" in Mic 5:1 (5:2) is explicitly called משיחא .

This penchant for interpretative expansions shows the interpreter's concern for the community and the place the Targum held in the worship in the Synagogue. Wurthwein says, "The community was to be taught and edified; it was necessary to spell out clearly for them the message of the Text" (p. 76).

The Targum to the prophets is more literal than the Targums to the Pentateuch. Churgin goes so far as to call Targum Jonathan "primarily a translation,"³⁰ as opposed to a paraphrase: "The T.J., although, on the whole, far from a literal adhesion to the text, is unmistakably careful to transmit both the sense and version of the text. The literal predominates in the historical portions of the prophets. Any rendering, then, not in accord with the Massoretic

reading constitutes a deviation from the reading" (p. 52). Thus one should not simply dismiss the Targum as some relic of rabbinic derash. Rather, it is important not only for the history of exegesis but also for textual and philological considerations.

THE TARGUM ON MICAH

The Targum on Mic 1:1 illustrates the faithful adherence to its Vorlage as well as the paraphrastic rendering of it. That is to say, while it reproduces the sense of the Hebrew, it does not do so in a wooden, literalist manner. It ensures that any word or phrase is properly understood and it avoids anthropomorphisms and the like. For example, rather than the stark "The Word of the Lord which came to Micah" of the MT, Tg renders this, "The word of prophecy from the presence of the Lord which was with Micah." Tg does follow the MT by omitting the conjunction between the names of the Judaeen kings (contrast LXX and P). Before "Judah" Tg adds "house." Finally, Tg also follows the MT by omitting a second וַיֵּלֶךְ before "Jerusalem" (contrast LXX and P). Thus Tg is a faithful, though not literal (as, e.g., V), rendering of the Hebrew text.

These characteristics are consistent throughout the translation. Circumlocutions are regularly employed for anything resembling anthropomorphic expression. For example, at 2:7 for "Spirit of the Lord," Tg has "Word from before the Lord." Jastrow notes that מִימָר is used to obviate anthropomorphisms (p. 775). This hypostatization is also used at 3:8 when the prophet says that he is "filled with the Spirit of the Lord" which Tg renders, "filled with the spirit of prophecy from before the Lord." Similarly at 3:11 where the people say, "Is not the Lord in our midst," Tg has "Is not the glory (שְׂכִינְתָּא) of the Lord...."

Tg characteristically supplies "house" before "Judah" or "Israel" (cf. 1:1 above). For example, at 6:2 where MT reads, "And he will argue it with Israel," Tg has, "And he will make reproof with the house of Israel." Closely aligned with this is the rendering of **בית** by **קהילה**. For example, at 4:8 Tg has "congregation of Zion" and "congregation of Israel" where MT has "daughter" before both (cf. also 1:13; 4:10; 4:13; contrast this with 4:14 where "daughter" is omitted in the derogatory **בת גדר**). Similarly, at 2:9 MT has "women of my people," which Tg renders, "congregation of my people"; at 6:2 for "house of Israel" Tg has "congregation"; and at 7:11 for "Israel" Tg has "congregation of Israel."

Tg can, however, be quite literal when the text is clear and anthropomorphisms are absent. Thus Tg translates 3:1 as, "Listen now, leaders of Jacob and rulers of the house of Israel; is it not for you to know judgment?" (Cf. 1:4; 4:12; etc.)

Tg also utilizes circumlocutions for words or phrases that refer to persons or things other than "the Lord." Tg explicitly interprets 4:14-5:5 messianically, calling the "ruler" **משיחא** in 5:1. For the phrase "his origins..." Tg has "his name will be proclaimed" Similarly, at 5:3 where MT has "he will be great..." Tg has "his name shall increase to the ends of the earth." Mention should also be made of the exegetical stance taken at 1:3 for "his place," which Tg renders, "is being revealed from the place of the house of his presence"; and at 4:1 for "mountain of the house of the Lord," Tg has **טור בית מקדשא**.

As was noted above in connection with P, Tg employs the technique of "converse translation." Three passages were cited where Tg and P utilize this in their translation; at 7:18 where the rhetorical question, which expects a negative answer, is turned into a negative statement; at 5:5 where the negative particle is inserted

before "he will deliver"; and at 4:14 where the derogatory reference to Zion is turned into an exhortation. Two other passages in Tg might fall under this category. At 2:8 Tg reads, "Because of their guilt, my people [will be handed over] to enemies." Contrast this with RSV, "But you rise against my people as an enemy"; and NEB, "But you are no people to me, rising up as an enemy to my face." The passage is admittedly difficult, but in the MT the people, or at least a segment of the people, rise up as an enemy, rather than being handed over to enemies because of their sins, as Tg implies. At 7:3 where MT reads, "Concerning evil, both hands do it well," Tg has, "Their hands do evil and do not do good." The Vorlage may have read לא היטיבון for להיטיב. Another possibility is that the Targumist himself introduces the change ad sensum since "to do good" in connection with "evil" would be out of place if the irony were missed. The change also requires only the addition of 'aleph. Thus, although it is not always easy to identify, "converse translation" appears to be a characteristic of Tg on Micah.

Tg is careful to render figurative language concretely; the morals drawn from metaphoric expressions are given rather than a translation of the expression. For example, at 4:13 where MT reads, "Arise and thresh," Tg has "Arise and kill (וקטיל).\" Where the MT has, "For I will make your horns iron," Tg has "For I will make the people strong as iron." The "people" also figure at 7:11 where MT reads, "It will be a day for building your walls." Tg has, "In that day the congregation of Israel will be built." Another example of concrete language used to translate figurative language is at 7:17 where "They shall lick the dust like a snake," is rendered by Tg as, "They will prostrate themselves upon the ground as the serpent." However, on occasion the metaphor may simply be translated, as in 1:4 where "Like wax before the fire, like waters poured down a

steep place," is translated by Tg as, "As wax from before a fire; as water which is poured out in a gutter."

The example of 7:11 above displays another characteristic of Tg. The simple "it will be a day for building (וְיִבְנֶה יוֹם)" is explicitly made an eschatological reference when Tg translates "day" by בַּעֲדָנָא הַהוּא . Tg interprets a passage eschatologically or messianically even when the Hebrew is not explicitly eschatological or messianic. This is especially noticeable at 7:6 where the lament over the breakdown of family relationships is given an eschatological setting by the insertion of "in that day." This passage also occurs in Jewish apocalyptic texts and even in the NT in an eschatological setting (see pp. 57ff.). We have already mentioned the messianic interpretation of 4:14-5:5, but mention should also be made of 4:8 where "Tower of the flock" is rendered "Messiah of Israel" by Tg. This follows from 4:7 where the phrase "The Lord shall be king over them" is rendered "The kingdom of the Lord shall be revealed...."

These characteristics or translation techniques illustrate the general tendency by the Targumist to make explicit anything obscure in the text or anything of theological importance. However, it is not a disregard for the text which prompts this; rather, he shows utmost regard for the text by rendering it ad sensum. Also, his concern for whom the translation is intended overshadows any literalist interpretation. It is more important that the community understands the meaning of the text rather than reproducing the text verbatim. Finally, reconstructing and accounting for the Vorlage of Tg is, as with the other versions, difficult and complex, but on the whole, the consonantal text of the MT is supported and the supposition of a different text-type or rescension for explaining the divergencies is unnecessary.

THE VULGATE

The problems that beset one when studying the versions--questions of origin, date, and influence--are diminished when examining the Vulgate. Jerome began translating the OT from the original Hebrew, the Hebraica veritas, in the last decade of the fourth century. His venture was not without criticism (most notably from Augustine), but by the seventh century the Vulgate was generally accepted in ecclesiastical circles. At the Council of Trent (1546), the Vulgate was declared the textus auctoritate plenus. The value of the Vulgate for text-critical purposes is enhanced by the commentaries of Jerome; he often gives the transliterated form of a Hebrew word, cites the LXX or other Greek versions (especially Sym), and quotes rabbinic sources to support or justify his translation. Generally speaking, the Vulgate does not represent an alternative text or recension of the MT. It does show the state of the Hebrew text which has come down to us as the MT nearly five hundred years prior to the existing manuscripts of the MT. As with the other versions, the Vulgate is not a uniform translation. Roberts attributes this to the influence of Jerome's Greek sources and rabbinic traditions, as well as the theological difficulties inherent when translating the Psalms and Prophets for a Christian community (OT Texts, pp. 254-258). Gribomont says that the translation by Jerome on the Prophets is, "a very literal translation of a difficult original."³¹ However, for Jerome the sense of a word or phrase was more important than finding an equivalent word.³²

THE VULGATE OF MICAH

V on Mic 1:1 is literal almost to a fault; the word order is followed exactly as the Hebrew, including the asyndeton of the MT and the rendering of the prepositions. This literalness is

characteristic throughout the translation of the book and the few exceptions illustrate Jerome's concern to render the words ad sensum, or influence from the LXX or targumic tradition. Quoting the MT side by side with V will illustrate this penchant for literalness:

MT: דְּבַר־יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר הָיָה אֶל־מִיכָה הַמִּנְשֵׁי בִּימֵי יוֹתָם אָחָז
יְחִזְקִיָּה מֶלֶךְ יְהוּדָה אֲשֶׁר־חָזָה עַל־שִׁמְרוֹן וִירוּשָׁלַם:

V: Verbum Domini, quod factum est ad Michaem Morasthiten, in diebus Ioatham, Achaz, et Ezechiae. Regum Iuda, quod vidit super Samariam et Ierusalem.

Jerome's concern to render his Vorlage according to the sense and not simply finding the equivalent Latin term manifests itself especially in the recognition of Hebrew idiom. For example, in 2:6 Jerome translates אל תטפן יטיפון as ne loquamini loquentes, "Do not speak, saying." Jerome correctly understands this as an idiom for speech and not literally as "dripping" (cf. LXX). This is confirmed by Jerome's comments on this verse where he says that this is a speech which flows and reaches the ears of the assembly. Jerome also translates Aq's literal translation of the Hebrew as ne stilletis stillantes, "Do not drip, dripping." A literal translation of this would not convey the meaning of these words.

It is somewhat curious, then, when Jerome translates the very next words, לא יטפן, as non stillabit, "It shall not drop." This too, however, is rendered ad sensum once Jerome's understanding of the pericope becomes clear. If dicit domus Iacob of 2:7 is taken as the conclusion of 2:6 (notice that the heh of האמור is not taken as an interrogative as in the MT; cf. RSV), then the "House of Jacob" is saying that judgment will not come. However, it appears from Jerome's comments that 2:6 is a word of rebuke from the Lord since Jerome asks, "Will the Lord not drop upon him, and

confusion apprehend him?" who worships idols and raises arms against the simple ones who believe and trust in the authority of the "greater one." This is borne out by Jerome's understanding of 2:11. RSV translates Mic 2:11 by, "If a man should go about and utter wind (רוח) and lies, saying, 'I will preach (אטק) to you of wine and strong drink,' he would be a preacher (מטיק) for this people!" Jerome, however, says, Utinam non essem vir habens spiritum (רוח), "Would God I were not a man that hath the spirit" (Douay). The prophet is speaking here of himself (cf. 3:8), and not of the false prophets. He goes on to say: Et mandacium potius loqueror, "And that I rather spoke a lie"; stillabo (אטק) tibi in vinum et in ebrietatem; Et erit super quem stillatur (מטיק) populus iste, "I will let drop to thee of wine, and of drunkenness: and it shall be this people upon whom it shall drop." Thus Jerome has interpreted this as a word of judgment from the Lord, and not, as the RSV would have it, a word of rebuke of the false prophets whom the people were so anxious to receive. The initial "Do not speak..." appears to be understood by Jerome as a wordplay upon the following words of judgment. Jerome's comments on 2:11 indicate that Micah is prophesying, and because he has the Spirit of the Lord, the people must bear these words of judgment. Thus in both renderings of the root Jerome is endeavouring to render ad sensum, and is not lapsing into wooden literalism.

Jerome, however, does not catch every idiom. RSV renders 2:1, "Woe to those who devise wickedness and work evil upon their beds! When the morning dawns, they perform it, because it is in the power of their hand" (כי יש לאל ידם). This difficult phrase is rendered by Jerome as Quoniam contra Deum est manus eorum, "Because their hand is against God." For Jerome כי is the reason for their egregious behaviour, not a continuation of the preceding

thought, and לֹא is not taken to mean "power" but designates Deity. We might see in this the possibility of influence from the LXX which renders this phrase, "For they do not raise [in prayer? or in anger, as in V?] their hand to God." The negative in the LXX may be a later insertion to blunt such a harsh expression as raising one's hand against God, or may have arisen partly from לֹא . Jerome makes no explicit mention of the LXX in his comments on this clause.

Influence from the other versions, especially the LXX, is evident in other verses, and is another reason why Jerome is not altogether literal with his translation of every verse. The influence from the LXX is not very strong, however, and manifests itself mainly in the vocalization rather than in a divergence in the consonantal text. For example, at 3:6 the MT reads חֶשֶׁכָּה whereas V has tenebrae and LXX has $\sigma\kappa\omicron\tau\acute{\iota}\delta\alpha$. These would suggest reading the noun חֶשֶׁכָּה , but the consonantal text is not in question. Similarly, at 4:3 where מִלְחָמָה is rendered by belligerare and $\rho\omicron\lambda\epsilon\mu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$. Notice also the translation of בָּצוּר in 7:1; V, in autumnno, and G, $\epsilon\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\mu\eta\tau\omega$. More often, however, V agrees with the MT against the LXX, or even all the other versions. For example, at 6:11 הָאֵזְכָה is rendered as namquid justicabo by V, but $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omega\theta\eta\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ by LXX, $\text{אֵיכָנָא נִזְדַּדְקוֹן}$ by S, and חִיזְכוֹן by Tg. Mention should also be made of $\text{וְהָרַבְּיָה לְבֵמֹת}$ in 3:12. In V this is rendered, et mons templi, which is probably ad sensum, but which occurs also in the Tg, $\text{וְטוֹר בֵּית מִקְדָּשָׁא}$.

Finally, Jerome's literalness and independence from the versions or even theological influence (i.e., avoidance of anthropomorphisms or christological interpretations) is illustrated by his treatment of Mic 4:5. This verse, which is easily misunderstood and which both the LXX and Tg render paraphrastically, is rendered

by Jerome word for word, Quis omnes populi ambulabunt unusquisque in nomine dei sui (cf. RSV, "For all the peoples walk each in the name of its god..."). Both Tg and LXX avoid this statement that suggests the existence of other gods besides Yahweh. (P, like V, is a literal translation of the Hebrew.)

In spite of Jerome's literalness, he is not above making the normal mistakes any scribe or translator is likely to make. At 1:9 he appears to have read אנושה as a niph'il ptc. from ישא, quia desperata est. At 4:8 עפל is confused with אפל, nebulosa, which the other versions likewise confuse. Also, the enigmatic האש עוד האש in 6:10 is rendered ahhuc ignis, as if he were reading האש.

These tendencies are characteristic throughout the translation of V which suggests that it also supports the consonantal text of the MT almost without exception.³³ Jerome has been literal throughout his translation except where the sense clearly demanded a non-literal translation (e.g., 2:6). No conscious or consistent effort is evident from Jerome to conform to the LXX or to a specifically Christian interpretation of a word or verse.

THE TREATMENT OF THE PALESTINIAN PLACE-NAMES IN THE BOOK OF MICAH BY THE VERSIONS

How the versions deal with the place-names of the Hebrew text can sometimes provide useful information about the translation itself.³⁴ Does the translator simply transcribe the Hebrew? If so, does the vocalization differ from the MT or other traditions? Does he give a Hellenized form of a place-name?³⁵ Or does the translator give a form that reflects the geographical nomenclature of his day?³⁶ Do the place-names in other books influence how the translator renders a place-name in his Vorlage? Does the translator show any awareness of how the place-names in other books were

treated? The answer to these and similar questions may lead one to conclude that a translator is unfamiliar with Palestinian geography, or that he is unfamiliar with other translations, or that geographical nomenclature in other passages was, or was not, the same as in the passage before him. This may even provide clues concerning the date or origin of a translation.

We begin by examining Mic 1:10-15 where the author uses the geography of the Judaeen countryside in an extended wordplay to warn of the coming disaster from the Lord. First, there are those place-names that present only minor difficulties for the translators or reflect scribal errors: Gath, Zaanan, Lachish, Mareshah, Adullam, and Jerusalem. In the LXX and V, Gath is vocalized as "Geth," and Adullam as "Odu(u)llam." In V, Zaanan is rendered in exitu, but Jerome says in his commentary, "Non est esgressa quae habitat in Sannam, quae interpretatur exitus," and further gives the translation of Sym as "Non est egressa habitatio abundans." For Mareshah the LXX has κατοικοῦσα λαχίς κληρονομία. This is difficult to account for unless גל and the first two letters of שבה(ו) were somehow read together or reduplicated (cf. Schwantes; see also Taylor for an alternative, and more complex, explanation). For Adullam P has "forever" (לעלם), which either reflects a scribal mistake (לעלם cf. Sebök and Taylor) or else arose through P's mistranslation of יבוא, as "he shall exalt" (לעלם; cf. p. 21). Finally, Zaanan is rendered as זצן by P, which may be influenced by the Egyptian city Zoan in Num 13:23 (cf. also Gen 13:10).

Since Tg and P share a common lexical stock with Hebrew, it is sometimes difficult to know whether the translator recognizes a place-name, or whether he simply reproduces the word from the common lexical stock. We can, however, note these divergencies. In the Tg at 1:11 בית צולא is read for Beth-ezel, which Jastrow

identifies as a place-name (p. 1267). Mention should also be made of Zech 14:5, "For the valley of the mountains will reach to Azel (RSV: "shall touch the side of it"). In the Tg לאצל is read for "Azel." It is not certain that Azel should be read as a place-name, and therefore any connection with Beth-ezel in Mic 1:11 is equally uncertain. P also appears to understand Beth-ezel as a place-name, "Beth-aozel" (Zech 14:5 is rendered as "disaster," לאולצנא). Tg places its treatment of Maroth in 1:12 at the beginning of the verse, "For she who dwells on the pleasant place of the earth" (שפר ארעא), and P confuses it with "rebellion" (עמורוּת דמרדּת). Aczib in 1:14 is translated by P, "The houses of vanity (דסריקוּוּתא) will become vain for the kings of Judah." The remainder of the place-names in this section appear to be recognized as such by both Tg and P.

The treatment of the remainder of the place-names in Mic 1:10-15 by the LXX and V is similarly mixed. Jerome makes no comments to indicate that he understands Beth-leaphrah, Beth-ezel, or Aczib as place-names. At Zech 14:5, V reads, "ad proximum." Jerome does, however, indicate that Shaphir, Maroth, and Moresheth-Gath are place-names, even though they are rendered in V as "pulchra," "amaritudinibus," and "hereditatem Geth" respectively. The LXX does not transcribe any of the remaining place-names. Whether this is because the translator wished to convey the sense of the paranomasia, as Jerome does on occasion, or whether he is simply unfamiliar with Palestinian geography is not certain. The latter is more likely since he does reproduce place-names where they are familiar or clear to him. Mention should be made of 1:10 where he renders לא ובנו as "Ye in Akim do not build...." Compare this with Amos 1:1 where בנקדים is rendered, ἐν νακκαρίμ. At Zech 14:5 the translator renders "Azel" as Ἰασόλ, whereas at Mic 1:11 he translates "Beth-ezel" as οἶκον ἐχόμενου.

There are also references to Palestinian place-names outside Mic 1:10-15. At Mic 1:1 Tg, P and V render **המרשתי** as a reference to Micah's home-town (Tg and P seem to connect this with Mareshah at 1:15, and V connects it with Moresheth-Gath at 1:14). The LXX treats **המרשתי** as a patronymic reference, "Micah, the son of Morashti," and not a place-name (cf. p. 13). Moreover, the translator does not appear to be familiar with the LXX of Jer 26:18 (33:18) which reads **Μιχαΐαις ὁ Μωραθίτας**.

Also in Mic 1:1 (and throughout the book) **שֶׁמֶר** is rendered by its Hellenized form **Σαμαρεία** in the LXX. V likewise does not transcribe **שֶׁמֶר** but renders it as Samaria. It is only at 7:14 that other place-names are rendered by their Hellenized form: **Βασανίτιν**, **Γαλααδίτιν**, and **Καρμήλου**. Notice also the names of the kings in Mic 1:1 which the LXX renders, **Ἰωαθαμ**, **Ἀχαζ**, καὶ **Ἐζεκίου**. Both the geographical names and the names of the kings in Mic 1:1 are rendered in their Semitic not Hellenistic forms by P and Tg, as we should expect.

At 5:1 (5:2) "Bethlehem Ephrathah" is reproduced by Tg, P, and V as it appears in the MT, whereas the LXX has "Bethlehem house of Ephrathah." Again the reading of the LXX is not easy to explain (cf. Taylor, Schwantes). Some scholars (cf. especially Wellhausen and J. M. P. Smith) have argued that the LXX represents the original reading; that is, that Bethlehem is a later, albeit correct, gloss on Ephrath (cf. the LXX of Josh 15:60) and that **בֵּית** originally preceded Ephrathah. The evidence from the other versions militates against this, and Schwantes argues that even the metre suggests that the MT is original. The LXX either arose through dittography, or "house" was inserted to draw attention to the clan names (cf. 1 Chr 4 and pp. 151f).

The names Shittim and Gilgal occur at Mic 6:5. Again Tg, P,

and V seem to recognize these place-names (notice that P uses samekh for shin in "Shittim," as throughout P as a whole). The LXX recognizes Gilgal (vocalized as "Galgal;" cf. V) but translates Shittim as τῶν σφόδρων, "the rushes." At Joel 4:18 (3:18) the same translation occurs in the LXX for Shittim. At Joel 4:18 (3:18) V, following Sym τῶν ἀκάνθων ("the bear's breeches" or "thorn-bushes"), reads spinarum.

Mention was already made of Bashan and Gilead at 7:14. Tg and P render "Bashan" as מִחְנֶן, the usual rendering of this place-name in these versions. The LXX and V vocalize "Gilead" as "Galaad." Rather than translating בְּתוֹךְ כְּרָמֶל (cf. RSV, "In the midst of a fruitful field"), the versions all seem to treat this as a place-name, "In the midst of Carmel." Many of the early commentators similarly take כְּרָמֶל as a geographical reference (cf. Pococke); however, it seems out of place in this verse (cf. J. M. P. Smith). Thus recent commentators translate it as "fruitful field" (cf. Mays, Allen, and Rudolph). Compare Isa 10:18, "And he will destroy the glory of his forest (יֶשֶׁר) and of his fruitful garden (כְּרָמֶל)."

We must exercise caution in drawing conclusions from these brief observations. Questions of date and origin remain elusive, although supportive evidence may be found in certain cases. The LXX has the most difficulty in recognizing the geographical names (especially in 1:10-15). This would suggest that the translator had little contact or familiarity with Palestine. We cannot, however, rule out the possibility that the translator is consciously translating (rather than transcribing) for the benefit of his audience. We know from Jerome's comments that even though he recognizes a word as a geographical location, he sometimes translates this rather than rendering the place-name. Since there is

no clear pattern in the translation of the LXX--sometimes he transcribes, sometimes translates, and sometimes gives a Hellenized form--it is more likely that he is not consciously translating, but is simply unfamiliar with the geographical nomenclature of Palestine. Furthermore, he also appears to be unfamiliar with the LXX treatment of place-names that occur elsewhere in the OT. This is especially evident in the rendering of Shittim in 6:5 (cf. Joel 4:18) as τῶν σχοίνων; cf. the LXX of Num 25:1; Josh 2:1; and 3:1. Also compare Mic 1:1 with the LXX of Jer 26:18 (33:18).

The vocalization of the place-names, where they are transcribed by the LXX and V, often differs from the MT: "Geth" for Gath; "Odollam" for Adullam; "Setim" (V) for Shittim; "Galgal" for Gilgal; and "Galaad" for Gilead.

Finally, in contradistinction to the LXX, Tg, P, and V display a greater familiarity with Palestinian geography and a greater awareness of place-names in other passages. This is not to say that they have no difficulty rendering the place-names (cf. P on Adullam [1:15]; Tg on Maroth [1:12]; and V on Aczib [1:14]); by the very nature of the place-names there is often ambiguity (cf. e.g., the treatment of כרמל by the versions [7:14]). The greater awareness of at least what critical scholarship has come to recognize as place-names in Micah by these versions is in part attributable to the greater proximity of these translators to Palestine (from Jerome's writings we know that he traveled and resided in Palestine while translating the Scriptures) and to the common lexical stock (in the case of Tg and P). Finally, the LXX appears to exert very little influence on V and P in their

treatment of place-names. This is especially noticeable in LXX having "in Akim" at 1:10; in the treatment of Mareshah at 1:15; and in the rendering of מרשהי in 1:1.

THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS AND MICAH

The fortuitous discovery of the scrolls from the vicinity of the Dead Sea represents the most important manuscript find for the study of the Hebrew text. Its bearing is eminent not only for the study of the biblical text, but also for the study of Palestinian Judaism and early Christianity. The scrolls augment our view of the social, political, and religious life in Palestine from the second half of the second century B.C. until 70 A.D., when the last resistance to Roman rule was totally squelched. Equally important, however, these scrolls antedate the previously available Hebrew codices by nearly a millennium. The impetus for OT text-critical studies has been monumental; in speaking of their importance, Talmon states, "It necessitates, in fact, a re-opening of the discussion on the history of the text, and a re-evaluation of theories which had been formed at the end of the nineteenth and in the first half of the twentieth century."³⁷

Texts, or fragments of texts, have been found for every OT book except Esther. In the case of Micah, the texts include fragments of a text from Murabba'at, fragments of a pesher-type commentary and fragments of a revised Greek translation. The fragmentary nature of these texts limits their usefulness for illuminating the text of Micah. In characterizing these texts from the Judaean Desert, Milik says, "For Ezekiel and the twelve minor Prophets, the textual variants are no less interesting, but, on the whole, these manuscripts all belong to the Masoretic tradition."³⁸

Certain salient features of Qumran biblical exegesis should be noted before the fragments themselves are examined. The Qumran sect (as also Judaism and Christianity) gained their identity as a community by their exegesis of biblical texts: "Virtually the whole of the Qumran literature springs from and testifies to the dedication of the Qumran sect to the study of Scripture."³⁹ The predominant feature of Qumran exegesis is peshet (pl. pesharim). Strictly speaking, peshet means "interpretation" and is used in various formulaic phrases to introduce the meaning of a passage (cf. Horgan, pp. 449-62). In scholarly discussions, the term carries two senses: first, it refers to a continuous commentary on units of a biblical text; second, it is used to refer to a non-literal interpretation usually associated with the above-mentioned literary works.⁴⁰

Vermes identifies six forms of exegesis in the Qumran literature (IDBSup, pp. 438-40): 1. peshet, e.g., 1QpMic; 2. midrashic paraphrase of large units, e.g., 1QapGen; 3. midrashic interpretation of smaller units, e.g., CD; 4. collection of proof texts, e.g., 4QTestim; 5. collection of legal texts, e.g., CD 4.20-5.2; and 6. collection of doctrinal texts arranged according to themes, e.g., 4QFlor.

The Qumran community used different methods of exegesis within these broad forms. Vermes lists three methods in particular (IDBSUP, pp. 440-41): midrashic supplement, Halachic reinterpretation, and fulfilment of prophecy. Bruce sums up their exegesis by saying, "They interpreted in such a way as to see their own duty in the perilous times through which they lived written clearly there for their instruction."⁴¹

The Dead Sea Scrolls on Micah have been the object of

critical study on numerous occasions (cf. Horgan, p. 104). The present study is itself indebted to the studies of, and especially the texts as transcribed by, Horgan and Barthélemy. The following comments will be restricted for the most part to the exegetical differences between the texts and the model text--i.e., the MT or LXX. This is not to minimize the importance of the differences in orthography and modes of expression (forms, case endings, use of prepositions, and so forth); however, our concern here is to draw attention to the exegetical tendencies as evidenced by the divergencies between the texts.

(Horgan, "The Texts," pp. 10-12)

1QpMic (1Q14)

Fragments 1-5

י[חוח] אדוני יהי[ה] בכם]	1
לעד אדוני מהיכל קודשו כיא הנ[ה] יה[וה] יוצא מ[מקומו]		2
וירד על במ[ותי הארץ] ונמסר תהרי[ם] תח[ת]ו והעמקים		3
יח[בקע]ו[
כדו[נג מפני הא]ש כ[מים מוגרים במרד בפשע יעקו]ב כול		4
[זאו]ת ובחט[אות בית ישראל פשרו על		5

Fragment 10

.[ש[]	1
מה פשע יעקוב הלוא שומרון [פשרו על מ..]			2
הפ[תאים] ומה במות יהודה			3
הלוא ירושלים פשרו על [מנ]ר[ה] הצדק אשר הואה			4
ו[ולכ]ו[ל] המהנדכים לוסף על בחירי			5
אל עושי תהורה [בעצת היחד אשר ינצל]ו[מיום			6
.[ל..[ל..[7
ושמתי שומרון ל[עי שדה			8
[ל[ל[9

Fragment 6

Fragment 7

].[1	ם[1
ב[אחרית ח]ימים	2	הלוא [2
ה..[כבוד]	3	הפתאים [3
אש[ר עברו]	4	צח כו[4
		ל[5

Fragment 8		Fragment 9	
]...[1]...[1
]...[2].לא.[2
Fragment 11			
]. []	אשר יתעור	1
		אויביר שלל וע[רום	2
		נבע ע[ד שער עמי ע[ד ירושלים	3
		י[דין אויביר	4
]. יבגוד []	5
]. . []	6
Fragment 12		Fragment 13	
]. . []	1		ונבים[
]. כבודו משעיר[2		
]. כי[א יצא אל מ[3		
]. . []	4		
Fragment 14		Fragment 15	
]. ראדון []	1]. מח[1
]. יר.[2]. אשר []	2
Fragment 16			
]. []	1		
]. ח. []	2		
Fragments 17-18			
[]	ח[]		1
		אתה חזרע ולוא [חקצור אתה תדרוך זית]	2
		ולוא חסוך שמן ותירוש ולו[א תשתחח [י]ין רי[שתמר חוקות	3
		עומרי]	
		וכול מעשה בית אחאב ותל[כר במועצותם ל]מען חתי אותך	4
		לשמה]	
		[וירושביה לשרקה פשרו] על הדור ה[אחרו]	5
		[] ים וביחם]	6
Fragment 19		Fragments 20-21	
]. הם []]...[חפת]אים]	1
].אנש[י בי]תו []	2
Fragment 22		Fragment 23	
]. מתי. שר[]	1]. []	1
]. והאור[]	2]. וזהלי[ארץ המה	2
]. ס.צ.ב.[]	3		
]. בל י..[]	4		

1QpMic

Fragments 1-5 comprise portions of Mic 1:2-5. In fragment 1 the word order of 1:2 appears to be reversed where "The Lord God" precedes the verb. This may be a stylistic difference, or influenced from 1:1 where היה follows אשר יהוה. The omission of ודרך (based on Milik's arrangement of the fragments!) in fragment 3 perhaps arose from its similarity with וירד. Since there is an implied threat in ירד, that is, the Lord is descending in judgment, not consolation, "He will tread" may seem superfluous. The versions support the MT: LXX, καταβήσεται καὶ ἐπιβήσεται; V, descendet et calcabit; S, ונחם ודרך; Tg, וויגלי וירמוס. But cf. the similarity with Amos 4:13, ודרך על במוני ארץ. Also in fragment 3, a definite article is attached to ארץ, whereas the MT is indefinite. G supports the definite article, τῆς γῆς, but cf. 1:6 where the MT is definite, השדה, and LXX has an indefinite ἀγρου. The definite article may be implied in the construct phrase (cf. RSV, "The high places of the earth" cf. also GKC §126h). At 7:12 the article is omitted, יום הוה, "In that day" (but cf. GKC §126aa which says that the omission is due to a "radical corruption of the text"). One cannot dismiss the possible influence on the Qumran text of 1:6 from the following line where "the mountains" has a definite article.

Fragment 10 consists of text and peshar on Mic 1:5 and 6.

The restoration of **מה** before **פשע** against **מי** of the MT is based upon line 3 of the fragment, **ומה במורה**. **מה** and **מי** share similar functions (GKC §137c); **מי** can be used of a neuter when a person is implied (GKC §137a; cf. Judg 9:28). Since these interrogatives share similar functions, and since the text itself answers **מי** with "Samaria" and "Jerusalem," the variation probably occurred early in the textual transmission. The versions support the MT (but cf. Tg, **איכה**); modern translations often employ "what" (RSV, "What is the transgression of Jacob?" cf. NEB). The peshar on these verses indicates that the community was at least aware of the **מי** tradition since they answer the question with reference to specific people. In answer to the question, "What is the transgression of Jacob? Is it not Samaria?" the commentary mentions **הפזמואים**, "The Simple Ones." Horgan observes, "Thus, those described as the 'simple ones' seem to be those who, though they observed the Law, were intellectually vulnerable and could be led astray" (p. 100).

Also in fragment 10 is the curious peshar on "What are the high places [RSV, 'sin'] of Judah? Are they not Jerusalem?" Rather than interpreting this line as a word of rebuke, which the context clearly suggests (cf. LXX, Tg, and P who translate "high places" by "sin"), the community transforms the phrase into a word of promise. **במורה** is obviously not thought to be a reference to cultic high places (cf. 1 Kgs 11:7) and Jerusalem is not seen as a place of apostasy in this verse, as it sometimes is in Qumran literature because of the wickedness of the priesthood. Rather, the community relates these words to the "Teacher of Righteousness" and "those who observe the Law." Vermes observes that the Damascus

Rule transforms the word of threat in Amos 5:26 and 27 into a word of promise;⁴² however, the community first modifies the text itself. Either the commentator is translating in his mind a word similar to **בְּמוֹתָ**, or, more simply, the verse is given an eschatological interpretation when Jerusalem is reoccupied and the "High (One)," the "Teacher of Righteousness," instructs "those who observe the Law."⁴³

Finally in fragment 10, the definite article on **הַשָּׂדֶה** (1:6) is omitted in 1QpMic. It appears that no uniformity exists in the use (or omission) of the definite article with a construct phrase in either biblical Hebrew or DSS.

Fragments 6, 7, 8, and 9 appear to be commentary, but so little is preserved that the meaning, unfortunately, is lost.

Fragment 11 appears to be peshar and text of 1:9. The words before the text of 1:9b allude to 1:8 reading the variant **שָׁלַל** against **שָׁלַל** of the MT. This reading may reflect the gere **שָׁלַל**, but since it is written without matres lectiones it is impossible to say whether the vowel intended supports the kethib or the gere (cf. Horgan).

Again in fragments 12-16 too little is preserved to make any observations on the text.

Fragments 17 and 18 comprise text and commentary on Mic 6:15 and 16. The text follows that of the MT. The commentary that follows interprets these verses eschatologically; **פֶּשְׁרוֹ עַל הַדּוֹר הָאַחֲרוֹן**, "The interpretation concerns the last generation." The verses lend themselves to an eschatological interpretation ("You shall sow but not reap...that I may make you a desolation..."). Compare this with John 4:37 where "sowing" and "reaping" are given an eschatological setting (cf. p. 65). Neither the Targum nor

medieval Jewish exegesis interprets the passage eschatologically.

Fragments 19-22 appear to be from Mic 7:6-9. In fragment 23 וְזוֹחֲלִי may be a citation of Mic 7:17 where MT has כְּזוֹחֲלִי; cf. LXX which has no preposition before the noun, and P which has the conjunction.

4QpMic

The identification and restoration of 4QpMic is uncertain and thus sheds little light on the text (cf. Horgan, pp. 502-505).

MURABBA'AT 88

The fragments of Mur 88 follow very closely the MT. The differences mostly regard the question of plene over against defectiva vocalization; e.g., at 2:7 הִלךְ is written where MT has הוֹלֵךְ; at 2:11 לֹא is written where MT has לוֹ; at 6:4 הָעֲלִיָּיִךְ is written over against MT הָעֲלִיָּיִךְ; and at 6:6 בְּעֲלִיָּיִךְ is written where Mt has בְּעוֹלָיוֹךְ. At 4:7 וְאֵל is written above the line, and at 7:4 the waw in מְבוֹכָהם is also written above the line. At 1:10 the gere, הַתְּפִלָּה, is written, and at 5:7 בְּאֵרֶיהָ is written where MT has בְּאֵרֶיהָ. Finally, at 7:5 the conjunction waw is added before אֵל; and at 7:12 the preposition beth is written before יוֹם.

The Greek Text (Barthélemy, p. 44).

Colonne 3

- Mi. I 1: () Λόγος t[etr . . .] μωρασθει 'Εν [. . .] βασιλέως ιουδα
"Ο[ν . . . ιερουσ]αλημ
2: 'Ακο[ύσατε . . .] και τὸ π[λή]ρωμα α[υ]τῆς . . . ἐν ὕμῳ
εἰς μάρτ[υρα . . .]
3: "Οτι ἰδοὺ tetr ἐκπ[ορευόμενος . . .] καταβήσεται Καὶ [. . .
4: . . . τακή]σον[ται] τὰ ὄρη [. . . ῥα]γήσον[ται] ὡς [. . .]
καταφ[ερ]όμενο[ν ἐν κα]ταβά[σει]
5: . . .] πάντα τ[α]υ[τά] Καὶ [διὰ ἀμ]αρτίαν [. . .] ἀσέβ[ε]σια ()
ιακωβ Ο[ὗ σα]μάρεια Κα[ὶ . . . οὐ]χὶ ιερουσαλημ
6: Κα[ὶ θ]ήσομαι σα[μάρειαν εἰς ὅπω]ροφυλάκιον τοῦ ἀ[γρ]οῦ
Καὶ εἰ[ς . . .] Καὶ κατασπάσω εἰς τὴν φάραγγα [. . .]
Καὶ τὰ θεμέλια αὐτῆς [. . .]
7: . . .] γλυπτὰ αὐτῆς κατακ[όψουσι . . .] μισθώ[ματα αὐτῆς
ἐνπρήσου[σιν . . .]

Colonne 4

- Mi. I 7: ... εἰ[δω]λα [α]ὐτῆς θήσ[ω ἀφανισμόν] δι[τι ἐγ]μισ[θώματος
...] καὶ ἕως μι[σθώματος ... συστρέψουσ]ιν
8: Διὰ τ[οῦτο ...] ἀνυπό[δετος ...]
- Mi. II 7: ... ἡγ[άθ]υναν μ[ετ'] ... πορευομ[ένου]
8: Καὶ ἐνπροσθ[εν ... ἀντέ]στησαν Κατένα[ντι ... περι-
β]όλαιον ἐξεδύσ[ατε ... ??]ται πόλεμ[ον]
- III 5: ...] τοὺς πλά[νωντας ... πόλεμο]ν
6: Διὰ τοῦτο νύξ [... κα]ὶ σκοτασθ[ήσεται ὑμ]εῖν [...
δ]ύσεται ὁ ἥλιος [...]

Colonne 6

- Mi. IV 3: ...] πολλῶ[ν ... μα]κράν Καὶ συνκόψουσ[ιν τὰς] μα-
χα[ίρας αὐτῶ]ν εἰς ἄροτρα Καὶ τὰς σιβύ[νας α]ὐτῶν
[εἰς δρέπ]ανα Καὶ οὐ () μὴ ἀνθήρη ἔθ[νος ἐ]φ' ἔθ[νος
[μάχαιραν] Καὶ οὐ () μὴ μάθωσιν ἔτι πολέμ[εῖν]
4: καὶ καθίς[ονται ἀν]ήρ ὑποκάτω ἀμπέλου αὐ[τοῦ] ...
σ]υκῆς α[ὐτ]οῦ [κα]ὶ οὐκ ἔστιν [...] "Οτ[ι τ]ὸ στόμα
t[etr] τῶ[ν] δ[υνάμεων] ...]
5: "Οτι πάντες οἱ λα[οὶ] πορεύονται ... θε[ο]ῦ αὐτῶν
'Ἡμεῖς [δὲ] πορεύομεθα ... te]tr θεοῦ [ἡ]μῶ[ν] εἰς
τ[ὸν] ...]

Colonne 7

- Mi. IV 6: ...] συνά[ξω ... ἐ]ξωσ[μένην ...] ἣν ἐκά[κω]σα
7: καὶ θήσ[ω ...] εἰς ὑ[πόλειμ]μα [...] ἐκπεπισμ[έ]νην
εἰς ἔθ[νος] ἰσχυρόν [...] tetr ἐπ' αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ ὄρει
σει[ων] ... ἕως τοῦ αἰῶ[νος]
8: [... αὐχ]μῶδης θυγάτηρ [... ἐλεύσεται] ἡ ἀρχὴ ἡ [...
ιερουσ]αλημ
9: [...] Μὴ βασι[λεύς ...] σου ἀπώ[λετο ... ὠδῶ]ν ὡς
τιχτούσης
10: ... θύ]γατερ σ[ειων] ...]
- V 1: Καὶ σύ () οἴκο[ς βη]θλεεμ ε]φρηθα ὀλι[γ]οστός () τοῦ
[εἶ]ναι ἐν χ[ιλι]άσιν ιο[υδα] 'Εκ σοῦ μοι ἐξ[ελεύσε]ται τοῦ
ε[ἶ]ναι () ἀρχ[ο]ντα ἐν τῷ ἰσραηλ καὶ αἶ[μα] ἑξοδοὶ αὐτοῦ
ἀπ' ἀ[ρ]χῆς ἀφ' ἡμ[ερῶν] ...]
2: Διὰ τοῦτο δώ[σει ... τυχτού]σης τέξεται Καὶ [...] αὐτοῦ
ἐπιστ[ρέ]ψουσιν 'Επὶ τοῖς ...]
3: Καὶ [στ]ήσεται () Καὶ πο[ι]μανεῖ () ἐν ἰσ[ρα]ήλ t[etr]
Καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐπάρσει () ὀνόματος tetr () θεοῦ [...]
Καὶ ἐπιστραφῇσονται "Οτι νῦν μεγαλ[υνθῇ]σόν-
ται ἕως περάτων τῆς γῆς
4: Καὶ ἔσ[ται] ...]

- Mi. V 4: ...] Ασσουρ ὅτι ἔλθῃ [... ἡμῶν] Καὶ ὅτι ἐπιβῇ ἐπὶ
τὰς βάρεις... ἐπεγεροῦμεν ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἐπτά ποι-
μένους καὶ ὁκτώ ἄρχοντας ἀνθρώπων
5: ... ποιμανοῦσιν τὴν γῆν ασσουρ ἐν ῥ[ομφαίᾳ...] γῆν
() νεβρωδ ἐν () παραξ[ιφίδι...] ασσουρ "Ὅτι ἔλθῃ
εἰς τ[ὴν...] ἐπιβῇ εἰς τὰ ὄρια [...]
6: ... ??] λοιπον () ιακωβ [...] ὡς δρόσο[ς...] χόρ-
τον...

Barthélemy argues that the fragments of a Greek text found at the Dead Sea environs are part of what he calls the *καίγε* rescension. This rescension attempts to bring the Greek text of the Old Testament into line with the extant Palestinian texts to which the translator had access. The following observations should be noted.

1:1. The text omits the formulaic *καὶ ἐγένετο* present in LXX.

1:2. *τό πλήρωμα αὐτῆς* is a more literal rendering of *πλην* than *καὶ πάντες οἱ ἐν αὐτῇ* of LXX.

1:3. *καταβήσεται καὶ ἐπιβήσεται* is read over against 1QpMic which omits *γῆν*.

1:4. Barthélemy's reconstruction of this verse represents a more literal rendering of the Hebrew text than LXX.

1:6. *τοῦ ἀργοῦ* agrees with the MT *הַתִּשְׁבָּה* but cf. LXX, ἀργοῦ, and 1QpMic, *הַתִּשְׁבָּה*.

1:7. The text preserves the pl. *יְשׁוּבֵי* of the Hebrew text, against the sg. of LXX.

2:7. The text employs the verb *ἀγάθω* to represent the Hebrew *יִיטְבֵּי* rather than *εἶσιν καλοί* of LXX. It is not clear whether the text follows LXX with *μετ' αὐτοῦ καὶ* after this, which is not present in the MT.

2:8. The text follows LXX by translating $\eta\gamma\mu\alpha\kappa$ at the beginning of the verse with $\xi\mu\pi\rho\sigma\theta\epsilon\nu$. The text sheds no light on $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\nu\tau\iota$ τῆς εἰρήνης κ.τ.λ. of LXX, except that τὴν δορὰν αὐτοῦ of LXX is rendered as $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\beta\acute{o}\lambda\alpha\iota\omicron\nu$ ἐξεδύσατε.

3:6. As in 2:7, the translator employs a verb, $\sigma\kappa\omicron\tau\alpha\sigma\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$, to do the work of a noun and verb, $\sigma\kappa\omicron\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha$ ἔσται, which the translator of LXX employs.

4:3. The text and LXX differ in their translations of this verse but both could be acceptable as translations of the Hebrew.

4:4. Notice the use of $\acute{\alpha}\nu\eta\rho$ ἰν' the text where LXX has $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\alpha\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$. Barthélemy lists this as a feature of the $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\gamma\epsilon$ recension.

4:5. The text agrees with the MT by employing $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ αὐτῶν (cf. the pl. for the coll. sg. of the Hebrew text) against τὴν ὁδόν αὐτοῦ of LXX. P and V also agree with the MT, but Tg characteristically avoids this tacit acknowledgement of the existence of other gods.

5:1. In Barthélemy's reconstruction $\omicron\lambda\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ precedes "Bethlehem" rather than "Ephrathah" as in LXX. This does nothing to shed light on either LXX or the MT. It may represent a textual problem in the Vorlage, or it may simply be an attempt to restore $\eta\gamma\beta$ before "Bethlehem."

5:3. The text omits $\acute{\omicron}\psi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ of LXX and the implied predicate after $\pi\omicron\iota\mu\alpha\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}$, thus agreeing with the MT. For τῇ δόξῃ of LXX the text has τῇ ἐπάρσει, and omits the definite article before ὀνόματος and $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$. It has $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\sigma\tau\rho\alpha\phi\acute{\eta}\sigma\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota$ (cf. LXX, ὑπάρξουσιν) for $\eta\gamma\psi\eta$ which points to $\eta\psi\eta$ rather than $\eta\psi$ for the root (cf. V, P, and Tg). Finally the text follows LXX with the pl. for $\eta\tau\lambda$ against the sg. of the MT.

5:4. The text appears to follow LXX on its translation of והיה זה שלום, but damage to the text makes this uncertain. Ἀσσοῦρ ὅτι ἔλαθῃ agrees with כי of the MT against LXX. Finally, the text also agrees with the MT, ושמונה נסיכי אדם (ὀκτώ ἄρχοντες ἀνθρώπων), where LXX has mistakenly read נשיכי (see p. 187).

MICAH AND THE NT

The use of the OT by the NT and the relationship between the testaments have engaged the attention of churchmen and scholars since the first commentaries and theological treatises were written.⁴⁵ The critical questions and theological issues involved in the use of the OT by the NT have been dealt with by others.⁴⁶ For the present study, however, we will mention the general exegetical tendencies and characteristics in order to give background and guidance to the examination of the individual texts.

Recent studies on the nature of the NT exegesis of the OT have focused on the common ground shared by both the NT authors and the early scribes and rabbis. The discovery of the text at Qumran and its environs are the cause of the renewed interest in the NT exegetical tendencies, and a source for comparison and evaluation. The common ground shared by the NT authors and their Jewish contemporaries should not be considered unusual, since the NT authors themselves were, in most instances, of Jewish ancestry, and since the early Christian literature was written generally for a Jewish-Christian audience.⁴⁷

Longenecker argues that though the NT authors shared exegetical procedures with their Jewish contemporaries, they themselves were not aware of following a certain exegetical mode; midrash, peshar, analogy, and literal interpretations all employed and interwoven throughout entire books and individual texts (p. 206).

Christocentricity is the conscious element in their exegesis; "The exegesis was functional, generally aimed at affirming, clarifying or defending beliefs about Christ of the church" (Hay, p. 444; cf. Lonenecker, pp. 203-09; Barrett, CHB 1, pp. 403, 405, 410). This blend of rabbinic and christological exegesis gives the NT use of the OT a distinctive perspective.

The only formal quotation of Micah in the NT occurs at Matt 2:6. The NT authors also make numerous allusions to portions of Micah, and use imagery from the book. Taken together, both formal quotations and allusions are necessary for a complete picture of not only the use or exegesis of a particular text, but also the text-form.⁴⁸

The texts chosen for examination were those listed in the "Index of Quotations," The Greek New Testament (2nd edition, 1968).

<u>Micah</u>	<u>NT Parallel</u>
4:7	Luke 1:33 (N)
4:9	John 16:21
4:10	Rev 12:2 (N)
5:2	Matt 2:6; John 7:42 (N; WH)
6:8	Matt 23:23
6:15	John 4:37
7:6	Matt 10:21; 35-36; Mark 13:12; Luke 12:53 (N; WH)
7:20	Luke 1:55 (N; WH); Rom 15:8

These citations were checked against the list of quotations in the Nestle (N) and the Westcott-Hort (WH) editions of the Greek New Testament, and are noted in the parentheses above. The differences in the three lists are obvious, and illustrate the difficulty in identifying the allusions. The present study follows the United Bible Society's list of citations since this gives the broadest possible context for comparison and evaluation.

In addition to the citations indicated above, the possible allusion to Mic 5:4 in Eph 2:14 will be considered, since these

two verses figure prominently in the history of the Christian exegesis of the Micah passage.

The problems which beset the exegete when examining the relationship between a NT text and the OT text that underlies it are similar to those encountered when examining the versions and the MT. Whereas the versions are primarily translation documents which often exhibit theological biases when closely examined, the NT is primarily a theological document, which translates, or employs a translation of a portion of OT scripture, for support or verification of its own intent. Thus, when the NT use of Micah is examined, the procedures of positing a possible retroversion of the Greek into Hebrew, comparing this with the MT, the versions, and other early Jewish and Christian literature, and offering an explanation of any differences, must be followed. Since the theological biases of the NT authors are generally easier to discern than those of the translators of the versions, the explanation must focus more closely on the particular context in which the author has given the quotation or made the allusion.⁴⁹

Matthew's Use of Micah

Since Matthew makes the most explicit use of Micah, his treatment will be set apart from the remainder of the NT. John 7:42; Luke 11:42; 12:53; and Mark 13:2 will be considered with their Matthaean parallels.

A. Matt 2:6; John 7:42 (cf. Luke 2:4).

Καὶ σύ, Βηθλέεμ γῆ Ἰούδα,
οὐδαμῶς ἐλαχίστη εἰ ἐν τοῖς ἡγεμόσιν Ἰούδα·
ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ ἐξελεύσεται ἡγούμενος,
ὅστις ποιμανεῖ τὸν λαόν μου τὸν Ἰσραήλ.

Matt 2:6 is a composite quotation of Mic 5:1 and 2 Sam 5:2. The context of the passage is the journey of the Magi to pay homage to the child, the "King of the Jews" (2:2). The Chief Priests and scribes tell the Magi that the "Christ is to be born in Bethlehem, as was written "by the prophet" (2:4 and 5).

καί σύ Βηθκέεμ κ.τ.λ. : for "Ephrathah" of the MT, Matt has "land of Judah." This phrase is influenced both by geographical considerations and tradition; "Now David was the son of the Ephrathite of Bethlehem in Judah..." (1 Sam 17:12; cf. Ruth 1:2; Luke 2:4). It is also influenced by the phrase τῆς Ἰουδαίας in vv. 1 and 5.⁵⁰ The phrase emphasizes the kingship of Jesus through David and the line of Judah (cf. Matt 1:2; Gen 49:10).⁵¹

οὐδαμῶς ἐλαχίστη κ.τ.λ. : the insignificance of Bethlehem, which the MT affirms, is transformed by Matt into a statement of its importance by the insertion of the emphatic negative particle. Soares-Prabhu argues that οὐδαμῶς is most likely dependent upon a non-MT Vorlage which read צעיר לא היום (p. 263).⁵² Moreover, he rejects the possibility that Matt is paraphrasing, because nothing is added to Matt's christological interpretation of the text.

The paraphrasing of this particular phrase, however, had already begun. The LXX puts the statement in the form of a question and, more importantly, the Tg adds the qualifying particle כ before צעיר.⁵³ Moreover, a contrast between the present insignificance of Bethlehem and its future importance as the birthplace of the coming "ruler" is expected in the text of Micah.⁵⁴ Matt draws upon early Jewish exegesis, as evident in

the versions, in order to transform the contrast, as implied in the MT, into a positive statement that what Micah had predicted has now come to pass--Bethlehem is no longer insignificant but is renowned inasmuch as the "Messiah" has now been born (cf. Gundry, Commentary, p. 29; Grundmann, p. 78). Thus the exegesis by Matt does have an implied christological importance: "Rather, for Matthew the birth of Jesus has transformed Bethlehem from the unimportant village it was at the time of Micah's prediction into the supremely important birthplace of the messianic king from David's line" (Gundry, Commentary, p. 29; cf. also Brown, Birth, p. 185, who thinks this may be a deliberate Christian change rather than a variant reading).

The word ἡγεμόσιν suggests re-pointing באלפי of the MT as באל(ו)פי.⁵⁵ Soares-Prabhu again posits a non-MT tradition. However, several considerations suggest that Matt is interpreting the Hebrew text christologically (cf. Gundry, Use, p. 92; Commentary, p. 29). First, the alteration of "clan" to "ruler" may be influenced by the existing personification of Bethlehem in 5:1: "And you, Bethlehem...." Second, the idiom ראשי אלפי ישראל occurs as a stylized phrase in the OT (e.g., Num 1:16; 10:4; Josh 22:21 and 30) and may be influencing Matt here. Third, ἡγεμόσιν serves to link this phrase with the quotation of 2 Sam 5:2 where the LXX employs ἡγούμενον (MT, נגיד) in reference to David.⁵⁶ Finally, Matt uses the term again in the third stichos of the quotation as a translation of מושל. Thus by employing "leaders" for באלפי Matt establishes the link with 2 Sam 5:2, and asserts Jesus' superiority over his predecessors in the Davidic line⁵⁷ (cf. also this same emphasis on the part of Matt when he substitutes "land of Judah" for "Ephrathah!").

Ἐκ σοῦ κ.τ.λ. : γάρ functions as the necessary link between the clauses, giving the reason for Bethlehem's importance. The omission of ⁵⁸ follows a general shortening of the phrase by Matt (cf. the omission of "in Israel" as well). This shortening serves to connect this with the quotation from 2 Sam 5:2. The ⁵⁹ from 2 Sam 5:2 functions essentially as the ⁶⁰ in Mic 5:1. Matt employs ἡγούμενος to translate מוֹשֵׁל (contrast LXX, ἄρχοντα). This draws attention to the passage in Sam as well as reinforcing Matt's apologetic of Jesus' regal claim.

The final stichos is a quotation from the LXX of 2 Sam 5:2 (cf. 1 Chr 11:2).⁵⁹ In order to bring this quotation into accord with the rest of the citation, Matt makes the necessary change from the 2nd sg., ποιμανεῖς, to the 3rd sg., ποιμανεῖ. Traditional Davidic motifs--Bethlehem, Shepherd, Ruler (King)--as well as the linguistic affinities mentioned above serve to connect the two OT passages (cf. also the idea of shepherding in Mic 5:3).

The foregoing discussion discloses that the Matthaean citation is neither a quotation of the LXX of Mic 5:1 nor a literal translation of the MT. Several explanations are possible. First, the possibility that Matt is dependent upon a non-MT Vorlage has been argued by Soares-Prabhu. Another possibility is that Matt is utilizing a different Greek translation from the LXX (cf. Lohmeyer). The position advocated above has focused attention on Matt's editorial reworking of Hebrew text representing the same consonantal text as the MT, and the influence effected from Jewish tradition (i.e., the same influences that are evident in the Tg of Micah) where it serves his christological purposes.

John 7:42 also preserves the tradition that the Jews expected the Messiah to be born in Bethlehem. Although John does

not state that Jesus was born in Bethlehem, the implication of the verse is that he was; writing in his "customary ironical style"⁶⁰ John portrays the Jews as, erroneously, believing that Jesus was born in Galilee. Luke 2:4 preserves the tradition that Jesus was born in Bethlehem. He does not, however, cast this into a promise-fulfillment motif, as does Matt, though the allusion may not have been lost on a reader well versed in the Hebrew scripture or tradition.⁶¹

B. Matt 10:21; 35 and 36; Luke 12:53; Mark 13:12.

In Matt 10, upon instructions from Jesus, the disciples are to go on a missionary journey to preach that "the kingdom of heaven is at hand (10:7). The discourse that follows is given an eschatological setting--"Heal the sick, raise the dead...." In the midst of the discourse Jesus remarks on the cost of service; "Do not think that I have come to bring peace on earth; I have not come to bring peace, but a sword" (10:35). This is immediately followed by a citation of Mic 7:6.

The text of Matt displays an independence from the LXX and a freedom with the Hebrew text of Micah. The striking difference between Matt and the LXX is evident in the choice of nouns employed to represent the Hebrew: *άνθρωπον* (Matt) and *υἱός* (LXX) in the initial clause and *ἐχθροί πάντες ανθρώπου* (Matt) and *ἐχθροί πάντες άνδρός* (LXX) in the final clause of the verse. In the middle clauses Matt uses *κατά*, whereas the LXX uses *ἐπί*, which further illustrates the differences between the two texts.

Matt uses the preposition *κατά* rather than translating the verbs of the Hebrew text. This brings out the contrast between the pairs more forcefully and, in this respect, is stylistically

similar to Jub. 23:19:

And they will strive with one another,
The young with the old, and the old with the young,
The poor with the rich, and the lowly with the great,
And the beggar with the prince....

This stylistic feature and the use of the possessive pronoun after the word-pairs gives the text a symmetry that differs from the symmetry of the Mican passage.

The LXX υἱός (cf. Luke 12:53) is closer to the MT than Matt's ἀνθρώπων, but Matt may be drawing upon the latter part of the verse (שׁוֹנֵא; cf. LXX ἀνδρός) for greater symmetry (Grundry, Use, p. 78). Furthermore, Matt avoids the asyndeton of the MT by using the conjunction καί throughout his text (cf. Peshitta).

The setting of Luke 12:53 and Mark 13:12 is also eschatological; however, the three passages have different settings. Luke's text conforms more closely to the LXX than Matt's text, though neither Luke nor Matt render the verbs in the MT. Also, the chiastic structure of Luke differs markedly from the structure of the LXX. Moreover, Luke abridges the quotation before the final line (contrast Matt). Luke agrees with the LXX in the choice of nouns and prepositions (ἐπὶ; contrast Matt, κατά). The chiastic structure of Luke emphasizes the mutual hostility (cf. Marshall, p. 549), whereas in Micah, the LXX, and Matt, the hostility is from the young to the old. Opposing factions is a common theme in the apocalyptic literature of Hellenistic Judaism (cf. Enoch 100:1, 2; Jub. 23:19; 2 Apoc. Bar. 70:3).

Mark 13:12 is the most allusive of the three citations. Ruptured familial relations follow governmental persecutions as a result of adherence to, and the preaching of, the Gospel (13:11). Mark adds fraternal hostility to the list of familial animosity

(cf. Enoch 56:7; 100:1, 2), and stands together with Luke by making the hostilities mutual rather than the young against the old (cf. Enoch 99:5).

The textual tradition in the three citations is difficult to untangle, but neither Matt, Luke, nor Mark presuppose a different textual tradition than the one preserved in the MT. The influence upon the Gospel texts by contemporaneous Jewish apocalyptic texts (Enoch 56:7; 99:5; 100:1, 2; Jub. 23:19; 4 Ezra 5:9; 2 Apoc. Bar. 70:3), and possibly among the Gospels themselves, as well as the occasional influence from the versions, can account for the widely divergent appropriations of Jesus' words by the individual Gospel writers. Mark is the farthest from the MT and the least influenced by the versions. The chiastic structure in Luke's passage, a device Jesus often employed, suggests that this may be the most primitive of the Gospel traditions (cf. Gundry, Use, p. 79; and, less certainly, Marshall, p. 549). Luke, however, conforms more closely to the LXX than the other Gospels. Matt's text appears to be assimilated to the Mican passage, even to the extent of including the final line of Mic 7:6 (contrast Luke and Mark).

Why are the passages given an eschatological setting? The Mican passage is a straightforward lament over the general depravity of a society where even familial relationships cannot be trusted. The LXX, Vulgate, and Peshitta all support the MT in this. The Targum, however, inserts **בְּעֵדְנָה הַהוּא**, "in that day." This phrase, or its equivalent, in the Tg of Micah marks the verses as eschatological; Mic 7:6, however, is an insertion independent of an underlying **בְּיָוִם הַהוּא**. The Mishnah preserves the tradition that, "With the footprints of the Messiah [the signs

which herald the coming of the Messiah] presumption shall increase and dearth shall reach its height..." (Sota 9:15). It is not clear why Mic 7:6 was appropriated by Jewish Apocalyptists, but by following this early Jewish exegesis, Jesus lays claim to messianic authority and issues a warning that persecution is part and parcel of belonging to the messianic community (cf. Allen, p. 389).

C. Matt 23:23 (cf. Luke 11:42).

Matt 23:23 is the fourth⁶² in a series of "woes" against the "scribes and pharisees." There are considerable differences between Matt's version and Luke's, two of which are particularly relevant to the present study. First, for "dill and cumin" Luke has "rue and every herb."⁶³ In the Mishnah not every herb is to be tithed ("rue" is specifically mentioned, Seb. 9:1; Schlatter suggests that this implies the possibility of doubt on the matter of tithing rue, cf. Marshall, p. 497). After discussing the difficulties between Matt, Luke, and rabbinic tradition, Marshall concludes, "The two lists probably reflect different recensions of Q (rather than M and Q traditions), and in both cases the pharisees are attacked for meticulous observance of the Law, certainly for going beyond the requirements of the OT and possibly for going beyond the oral law..." (p. 497). Matt's version reflects a greater knowledge of rabbinic tradition (as preserved in the Mishnah), whereas Luke seems dependent upon his source.

The second difference concerns the "weightier things of the Law" (omitted by Luke).⁶⁴ Both Gospels preserve κρίσις from their source(s), but Matt inserts ἔλεος and τὴν πίστην, whereas Luke preserves the tradition of his source (τὴν ἀγάπην τοῦ θεοῦ is not a Lucan phrase; Marshall, p. 498, Gundry, Commentary, p. 464). The changes appear to be due to Matt's reworking of

the tradition; one must ask on what basis he does this.

Gundry argues that "mercy" (cf. Luke's use of ἐλεημοσύνην, "charity, alms," in 11:41!) replaces "love for God" in the traditional woe, since "mercy" and its cognates occur frequently in Matt, and in Matt 22:37-39 "neighbourly love" is put on par with loving God. However, "faith," for Matt, is directed toward God (Gundry, Commentary, p. 464), hence functions essentially as "love for God" in the traditional woe. Gundry mentions this but argues that "faith" acts to compensate for the insertion of "mercy" and its replacement for "love of God" (Commentary, p. 464).

Matt's three-fold saying, however, is remarkably reminiscent of the three-fold requirement from God in Mic 6:8: "To do justice, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with your God." Moreover, Matt appears to go beyond the traditional saying, a device he also used in 10:35 where he supplants a Jewish apocalyptic saying in the Gospel tradition (Mark 13:2), by quoting the OT passage which underlies it (Mic 7:6).⁶⁵ Gundry says that it is "part of Matthew's style to allude often to the OT" (Commentary, p. 463). Also, the similarity in parenesis between the Micah passage and the Gospel tradition--both Micah and Jesus berate their audience for outward manifestations of worship, while neglecting the "weightier" matters of the Law--suggests that Matt may again be grounding a dominical saying more firmly in its OT background. The jibe would not be lost on a careful reader.

If this is indeed an allusion to Mic 6:8, it shows no linguistic or theological affinities with the versions. The LXX employs κρηλα for משפט, whereas Matt's text has κρηλα (both terms are used frequently to render משפט). Both the LXX and Tg render the enigmatic הָצִנֵּעַ לִכְתּוֹב עִם אֱלֹהֵיךָ somewhat paraphrastically. The LXX

reads "to be ready to walk..." and the Tg adds "fear," to avoid the starkness of walking "with God."

One objection against viewing Matt 23:23 as an allusion to Mic 6:8 is that the final word in the Matthaean saying is not equal to "walking humbly with your God" (although Gundry mentions Matt's frequent use of OT, he does not see this verse as an allusion to Mic 6:8). However, since **הצנע** only occurs in Mic 6:8 and Prov 11:2 in the OT, it is difficult to ascertain precise nuances of meaning. For Matt, faith is directed towards God; Bultmann says, "In primitive Christianity **πίστις** became the leading term for the relation of man to God" (TDNT, vol 6, p. 205). Thus the term "faith," though not a translation of **הצנע לכת**, may be seen at Matt's exegesis of the phrase since both terms are concerned with the proper relationship with God. Viewed in this light, the two passages correspond more closely than at first appearance.

The Matthaean passage also helps in elucidating Mic 6:8, or at least showing one possible understanding of it. The Mican passage is sometimes seen as a rejection of ritual observance. Since the "Law" is often abrogated in the NT--Jesus himself makes a point of breaking the law on numerous occasions (e.g., Matt 12:1ff.), one might expect support for this interpretation of Mic 6:8 in the NT. Both Matt and Luke, however, uphold ritual observance in the final clause of the verse; Luke's **μὴ παρῆναι**,⁶⁶ "do not neglect," is synonymous to Matt's **μὴ ἀφείναι**, "do not forsake." Thus in these passages ritual observance is not set against inward piety, but each grows from the other.

Allusions to Micah outside Matthew

A. Luke 1:33 (cf. Isa 9:7)

Mic 4:7 is a prophecy of the eschatological rule of Yahweh over the remnant in Zion. Luke omits בְּהָר צִיּוֹן, but the reference to the "throne of David" makes this superfluous. Luke is not dependent upon the LXX: he renders וְגַד עֲלֵי by οὐκ ἔσται τέλος, whereas the LXX employs εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.⁶⁷ No affinities with other versions are evident. By alluding to Mic 4:7, Luke makes a notable blending of the eternity of Yahweh's reign⁶⁸ (Mic 4:7) with Davidic promises⁶⁹ (Isa 9:7), which find their fulfilment in the birth of Jesus.

B. Luke 1:55; Rom 15:8, 9.

God's mercy is the focus of attention in Luke's passage; hence Mic 7:18, 19 are as much a part of this allusion as the linguistic affinities with Mic 7:20. τῷ Ἀβραάμ functions as a parenthetical indirect object to μνησθῆναι ἐλέος (cf. Marshall, p. 85; but see Plummer, p. 34). The promise in Luke is confined to the spiritual offspring (σπέρμα) of Abraham (contrast the "proud," "rulers," and "rich" who have been removed from the "humble" and "hungry" in 1:51-53).

Whilst the emphasis in Luke's passage is on God's mercy, Romans emphasizes the promises of God, promises of truth and mercy. Although there is a major exegetical problem in Rom 15:8, 9 (the relation of the infinitives in 8b and 9a to εἰς τό),⁷⁰ this study is not dependent upon its resolution.

The Romans passage stresses the universal nature of God's promises in sharp contrast to the restricted reference in the Lucan passage. The blessing comes to the Jews ὑπέρ

ἀληθείας (cf. Rom 3:3; 11:29; LXX: δώσεις ἀλήθειαν τῷ Ἰακώβ), and to the Gentiles ὑπὲρ ἔλεους (cf. Rom 11:30, 31; LXX: ἔλεον τῷ Ἀβράμ). Paul employs the rabbinic exegetical principle *מקראות גדול* , "the general and the particular"; Jacob stands for the "circumcision," that is, Israel (cf. Rom 9:13, 11:26), and Abraham stands for the Gentiles (cf. Gal 3:6-9, 14).

The Vorlage of the NT text is difficult to establish. The LXX is a literal translation of the Hebrew and, since the citations are so allusive, any connection between it and the NT texts would be purely hypothetical. That the LXX has not influenced Luke 1:55 seems evident in the divergent treatment of *מִן הַיָּמִים* where one might reasonably expect an agreement; Luke employs εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα , whereas the LXX has the more literal τὰς ἡμέρας τὰς ἔμπροσθεν (cf. the divergent treatment of *מִן הַיָּמִים* in Luke 1:33 above). Since ἀληθείας and ἔλεος are the most common translations of *אמת* and *רחמים* , we cannot draw any conclusions on the influence by the LXX on Paul. The Tg has not influenced either passage since the homiletical expansion with which the Tg treats Mic 7:20 is not evident in either Luke or Rom.⁷¹

C. John 4:37

In John 4:37 the proverb "one sows but another reaps" is said to be "genuine" or "accurate" (ἀληθινός; cf. Barrett, John, p. 160; Bultmann,⁷² p. 53). According to Barrett, the proverb stems from Greek rather than Hebrew sources (citing Aristophanes, Equites 392, and Philo, Legum Allegoriae III 227). An aphorism such as this, however, is more likely to be a part of the general heritage of the wisdom tradition of any ancient society (R. E. Brown,

John, p. 183), especially since the general idea is well attested in the OT itself (Bultmann, p. 198). While dependence on Mic 6:15 cannot be established, some general observations about its use can be made.⁷³

In the OT the separation of sower from reaper is a sign of judgment (cf. Mic 6:15; Deut 28:30; see also Mic 2:4). Jesus extends the meaning of this proverb to be a "pessimistic reflection on the inequity of life" (Brown, John, p. 183; also Barrett, John, p. 242). In the Johannine passage, the sower and reaper rejoice together (4:36). The paradoxical character of this event is resolved by the eschatological mission of the disciples: "And he that reapeth receiveth wages, and gathereth fruit unto eternal life..." (4:36).

That "others" have sown (the Law, Prophets, and especially Jesus himself) and yet the disciples reap (a metaphor for missionary work; cf. Matt 9:37 and 38; Bultmann, p. 197) is an eschatological sign: "The rules of human activity are not applicable to such an event" (Bultmann, p. 197). Thus what was in the old order (typified by the physical harvest) a word of judgment and cynicism, becomes in the eschatological order (typified by the spiritual harvest) a word of rejoicing.⁷⁴

D. John 16:21; Rev 12:2 (cf. also Isa 66:7-9).

These passages are beset by a series of complex issues; hence the context of each pericope will be presented first to facilitate the discussion about their relationship.

Mic 4:9 and 10 is the first in a series of oracles which contrast the present distress of Jerusalem with the future hope of the people. The prophet asks a series of satirical questions that demonstrate the severity of the present distress. The final

question compares their distress with the agony a woman feels in childbirth.⁷⁵ In 4:10 childbirth imagery is again used to reiterate and enhance the message of present judgment--their agony is justified because the situation gets worse. The oracle closes with a word of deliverance; not deliverance from the present situation, as was hoped for, but deliverance through the judgment of the exile.

The word of deliverance at the end of this oracle points the childbirth imagery to the final oracle of the series (4:14-5:5; especially 5:2). From this metaphor the prophet introduces the concept of God inaugurating a new phase in dealing with his people (cf. Mays, pp. 106, 116).

John 16:21 contrasts the false joy of the world when Jesus dies with the true joy of the disciples, which goes beyond the sorrow of Jesus' separation from them to the time when he will be with them again. Jesus uses a simple parable of childbirth to illustrate this paradox; a woman has sorrow during the birth process but joy when the child is delivered.

Rev 12 is a complex blending of myth and Christian theology. The author employs the childbirth imagery in verse 2 where a woman in labour gives birth to a male child who is to rule "all nations" (12:5). A "dragon" is waiting to devour the child at birth, but the child is "caught up to God" (12:5), and the woman escapes to the wilderness (12:6).

There is no obvious relationship between the passages cited above. The roots of the NT passages are grounded in a number of OT passages, of which the Micah pericopes are a part (see e.g., Isa 26:17 and 18; 66:7-10; Jer 4:31; passim; Hos 13:13, cf. also I QH 3:8ff). Though linguistic affinities between the

passages, or the versions on Micah, cannot be established, the use of this complex imagery can be commented upon.

In John 16:21 the childbirth serves as a contrast between sorrow and joy. The meaning of the passage need not be limited to this obvious interpretation, as with Bernard: "The image provides a familiar and touching illustration of the truth that pain is often the necessary antecedent to the supreme joys of life" (p. 515). Nor must one resort to allegory, as with Loisy: the woman represents the synagogue converted to Christianity (as quoted in Bultmann, pp. 179f.). The travail imagery employed--חבלי המשלח of Jewish doctrine--gives this passage eschatological significance. Similarly, the reference to Jesus' death and resurrection points to the suffering and joy of the messianic community before the Parousia: "The resurrection means, in an anticipatory way, the realization of the messianic salvation" (Barrett, John, p. 493).⁷⁶

In the light of the Mican passage then, the joy of the disciples at the emergence of the new dispensation (both in the resurrection and Parousia) compares to the joy of Israel⁷⁷ at her deliverance and, further on, to the inauguration of Yahweh's new dealings with her. Though the idea of judgment is lacking or buried in the Johannine passage, the theme of necessary suffering before joy is evident.⁷⁸

The childbirth imagery in Rev 12 is not a parable of suffering and joy, but a metaphor announcing the birth of a ruler. The complex symbolism of this passage provides ample rope for an interpreter to hang himself; nevertheless, some cautious remarks concerning the use of the childbirth imagery can be made. It seems unsatisfactory to drive a wedge between understanding the passage either on historical grounds or cosmological grounds; that is, the

reference is either to the birth of the OT Messiah and the NT Christ, to Satan's attack against Jesus on earth, or to the struggle between darkness and light, Satan and God. The eschatological character of the passage allows the historical even to become anticipatory of future significance.

First, the woman in Rev 12:2 is to be identified with the People of God, the messianic community.⁷⁹ Brown takes it further to suggest that this also refers to Mary who is a personification of the messianic community (John, p. 732); but Mounce rejects this, preferring to interpret the pericope according to a consistent non-temporal struggle between God and Satan.

Second, although Caird may overstate the case when he says, "By the birth of the Messiah John means not only the nativity but the Cross" (p. 149), nevertheless, the connection between the agonizing birth of the child and the death and resurrection of Jesus comprises part of the symbolism of this passage. This is evident in 12:5 where the child is caught up to God (cf. Rev 1:5 where Jesus is called the "firstborn of the dead").

In the light of the Micah passage, the historical allusions in Rev 12 have closer affinities with the announcement of the birth of a ruler in Mic 5:2 than the idea of tribulation in Mic 4:9 and 10. The eschatological setting of Rev 12, however, aligns itself more with Mic 4:9 and 10 (and, consequently, with John 16) where a new order of things is established through $\theta\lambda\iota\psi\iota\varsigma$.

E. Eph 2:14 (cf. Isa 9:6)

The context of Eph 2 is the union that Christ establishes between Jew and Gentile, a union predicated on the reconciliatory peace which Christ brings from God. Most modern commentators⁸⁰ do

not make reference to Mic 5:4 when commenting on Eph 2:14. However, since both Jews (e.g., Kimchi) and Christians have understood the enigmatic phrase **והיה זה שלום** to be a reference to the Messiah, investigating a possible link between the two passages seems warranted.

As with other allusions to Micah in the NT, Eph 2:14 is neither an adaptation of the LXX translation, nor a literal translation of the Hebrew text. Rather, it appears to be an ad hoc adaptation of a text. The difference between the NT texts and the MT lie in the addition of **γάρ** and **ἡμῶν**, and the express use of **αὐτός** (contrast LXX, **αὐτῇ**) as the subject and **ἡ εἰρήνη** as the predicate.

Schlier argues that the immediate background of the Eph 2 passage lies in the author's use of the Gnostic Redeemer myth as a conceptual vehicle for proclaiming the redemptive event of the reconciliation between Jew and Gentile wrought by Christ. On the other side of the spectrum, Barth argues that the quotation of Isa 57:19 in Eph 2:17 (cf. also 2:13) forms the general background to the pericope. Rather than becoming ensnarled by this debate, our remarks will be limited to observations about Mic 5:4 and Eph 2:14.

At the outset, two observations can be made. First, concerning the Ephesians passage, the author follows the general NT practice of interpreting OT passages or concepts christologically; Jesus the Messiah is said to be the **שלום**. Second, the Tg on Mic 5:4 paraphrases the enigmatic phrase by **ויהי מבכין שלמא לנא**. Note especially the addition of **לנא**, and cf. **ἡμῶν** in Eph 2:14.

In Micah and Isaiah, several passages link peace with messianic expectation. In Isa 57:19 peace is promised to him who is

"far off" and him who is "near"; in Mic 5:4 the "ruler" brings peace amidst the "Assyrian" threat; Isa 9:5 promises the birth of a child (cf. Mic 5:2) who will be called "Prince of Peace" (cf. Isa 52:7 which mentions one who brings "good tidings" and "peace").

If, as Barth argues, the author of Ephesians "more than once reflects traces of rabbinic commentation and goes beyond or corrects its results" (p. 31), then the loose strands noted above can be threaded to form a possible link. Since peace is the theme that runs throughout the pericope, and since an OT passage concerning peace is explicitly quoted (Isa 57:19 at Eph 2:17), then other texts relating to this theme and falling within established "text-plots"⁸¹ could be drawn upon to support the development of thought in the passage. Moreover, since the author draws upon rabbinic tradition, in the light of the Tg on Mic 5:4 where אלו is added, the author may once again be drawing upon the tradition at his disposal (cf. especially the change from "you" in 2:13 to "our" in 2:14).

Whether or not the author is indeed drawing upon Mic 5:4, the fulfilment in Eph 2:14 is greater than the individual OT prophecies as Christ is said to bring peace both between his people (the Jews) and their neighbours (the Gentiles), and between God and Man.

Several observations and questions emerge from the study of these texts--not all of which receive clear or sufficient answers. The foremost issue is the text; does the NT text uphold the MT or reflect a non-MT Vorlage? What influence, if any, do the versions exert on the NT text? On the basis of this study, three general statements about the texts will be defended. First, there is no compelling reason to suppose a different textual tradition than that

found in the MT. Second, with the exception of Luke 12:53, the LXX exerts no discernible influence on the NT use of Micah. Third, when there is a demonstrable influence on the NT, the same influence also appears in the Tg. The reverse of this is not true; not all of the Tg's theological reworking of the Mican text appears in the NT.

First, the probable Vorlage of the NT text gives no reason for emending the MT. The principal text is Matt 2:6; the other references are so allusive that retroversion for purposes of emendation is highly speculative. Matt 2:6 differs considerably from the MT but the differences can be explained on the basis of Matt's christological exegesis of Micah's text. The most probable alternative reading to the MT is באלפי for באלפי. However, the christological implications of Matt's interpretation militates against even positing this as an alternative reading, let alone using the NT to emend the MT (which has full support from the versions). Moreover, even the enigmatic צעיר להיונה has the support, albeit diverse, of the versions, and Matt's interpretation need not imply a different Vorlage. Concerning this text, Stendahl concluded, "Yet this does not mean that Matthew had a Hebrew text other than the MT. His different reading should rather be understood as an ad hoc interpretation of the MT's consonantal text."⁸² To this we could add that the ad hoc interpretation shows a blending of midrashic and christological exegesis; Matt is not merely translating but reinterpreting while he translates.

What is true of Matt 2:6 can be extended to the allusions to Mican texts in the NT. Even the allusion to Mic 7:6, which is treated so diversely by the Evangelists, does not suggest a different text so much as the liberty the NT authors took with the OT text.

Secondly, the knowledge or influence of the LXX translation does not appear in any of the allusions to Micah, with the possible exception of Luke 12:53. To state this positively, when there is a real point of comparison between the NT and the LXX of Micah, the NT shows remarkable independence from the text of the LXX. This is true in the formal quotation in Matt 2:6 where "land of Judah" is read over against "house of Ephrathah" of the LXX. Also, Matt has a negative emphatic particle where the LXX has ὀλιγοστός. Moreover, Matt has "leaders" where the LXX has "thousands" (for בָּאֲלָפִים), and ἡγούμενος (Matt) and ἄρχοντα (LXX) are read for מְשִׁיחִים. Similarly Matt 10:35 and 36 differ both in structure and translation from the LXX of Mic 7:6; and Matt 23:23 employs different words where one might well expect an agreement (e.g., κρίσιν [Matt] and κρίμα [LXX] for מִשְׁפָּט of the MT).

Outside Matt's Gospel, Luke 1:33 shows minor differences with the text of the LXX on Mic 4:7; Luke 1:55 employs εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα over against the LXX, τὰς ἡμέρας τὰς ἔμπροσθεν for MT's עַד מְיָמַי at 7:20. John 4:37 translates רָצָה by θερλζων where the LXX has ἀμῆσης; and finally, Eph 2:14 differs markedly from the LXX of Mic 5:4.

The one text that does show a possible influence from the LXX is Luke 12:53. The textual tradition that underlies the three allusions to Mic 7:6 in the Synoptics appears to be mixed. The passages support the eschatological interpretation of Mic 7:6, though each in a different setting. Neither Mark nor Luke view the allusion as fulfilled prophecy, which Matt evidently does (Matt's text conforms most closely to the MT, to the extent that he adds the final stichos to the prophecy which is absent from Mark and Luke). Mark shows the least proximity to the Micah text. One possible explanation of this

is that the words are part of the dominical tradition, as preserved by Mark. Matt, recognizing the affinities with Mic 7:6, anchors the words in the OT text (laying claim to Jesus' messianic authority). Thereupon Luke, aware of Matt's rendering (and perhaps less familiar with the Mican text and especially Jewish exegesis of it --Tg's eschatological interpretation and the Jewish apocalyptic texts) draws upon the LXX to render his translation.⁸³

The observation that the LXX of Micah does not appear to exert much influence on the NT use of Micah raises the question of whether the LXX was widely circulated in Palestine, or, if it was, whether it was highly regarded as a translation. With so little evidence and with so elusive citations, this is all but impossible to answer with any degree of certainty. A. Baumstark's examination of the non-LXX quotations in Matt from the Minor Prophets indicates that the textual variations between Matt and the MT have a parallel in the Tg.⁸⁴ He further argues that Matt's Vorlage is based upon a lost Targum which is similar to the Vorlage of the Samaritan Pentateuch (p. 313). The observation that the NT use of Micah is not influenced by the LXX, and the results of Baumstark's study, lead us to the final statement, namely, that the Tg and the NT show remarkable affinities in certain texts. The most explicit example is Mic 7:6 which is given an eschatological twist--"In that day"--by the Tg and is in an eschatological setting in the Synoptics. There are also similarities in the explicitly messianic interpretation of Mic 5:1 in the Tg and Matt 2:6. Moreover, צעיר להיוט is paraphrased by the qualifying particle kaf in the Tg, כְּצֶעִיר, which Matt carries one step further by οὐδὲν ὥς. We argued that this had christological implications, but we may also see where translators were, at an early stage in the transmission of the text, already trying to bring

out the contrast implied in the Hebrew text. We see this in the LXX,

ὀλιγοστός εἰ τοῦ εἶναι κ.τ.λ. , which might be rendered as a question, or in the Lucianic texts which insert the negative μή before ὀλιγοστός . Might we also see a connection between the Tg's בלפיא דביה יהודה and Matt's ἡγεμόσιν ? Finally, there are also the affinities between the Tg of Mic 5:4 and Eph 2:14 (especially the possessive pronoun "our").

This is not to say that the NT always follows the exegetical traditions that are preserved in the Tg. For example, the Tg of Mic 7:20 has an homiletical expansion on the traditions of the patriarchs that does not appear in Luke or Paul. This again shows the freedom that the NT authors exercise when dealing with the OT texts and the traditional interpretations which surround them.

Another observation which emerges from the study is that the citations, whether formal or allusive, fall within certain text-plots which the early Christians understood as having special reference to the life and ministry of Jesus Christ and the events surrounding his imminent return, and the life of the church.⁸⁵ The two citations that do not fall within the text-plots, viz., Mic 6:8 and 15, are not presented in the fulfilment motif normally associated with the text-plots. Rather, these texts fall under a more general rubric of "folk theology." Mic 6:15 is explicitly called a "saying" (ὁ λόγος), which suggests its proverbial character. The allusion to Mic 6:8 is not presented as a proverb, but this text was highly regarded in rabbinic theology⁸⁶ and has been called the "high water-mark" of OT religion.⁸⁷

Finally, though the NT authors share the cultural milieu of the rabbis and Qumran sect, and employ many of the exegetical

practices of their contemporaries, the atomizing effect of much of this exegesis (especially Qumran pesher) is largely absent from the texts we have examined.⁸⁸ To be sure, the texts are presented in the light of their fulfilment in the person and work of Jesus Christ, but the OT context is not dismissed out of hand; the fulfilment often goes beyond what the OT author envisioned only because of the new revelation of God in Jesus Christ.

CONCLUSIONS

In this initial study of the text of Micah, we have sought only to identify the general characteristics and exegetical tendencies of the early witnesses to the text. We have not attempted to explain and classify every divergence between these witnesses and the MT, and thus our conclusions concerning the text must also be general. Which particular reading is "original," or the "best," must still be decided on an individual basis; however, the general conclusions may help in reaching that decision.

These initial, and therefore tentative, conclusions concerning the characteristics of the early witnesses to the text of Micah require a fuller treatment than was possible here. The effect a rendering makes in the translation and greater precision in the terminology for and identification of "variant readings" must guide any further investigation. What emerges from this study is that, though the MT is admittedly difficult in spots, the versions and the other early witnesses are of marginal help for emending the text. That is, these witnesses appear to represent a text that corresponds to the consonantal text of the MT. When a divergence is clearly discernable, it usually represents an inferior reading due to normal scribal errors, lack of knowledge, influence from other sources or translations, or biases of the translator or scribe.

We argued that the NT citations and allusions, where retroversion is possible, witness to the consonantal text of the MT. The authors, particularly Matt, take liberty with the text, especially when a christological point is being made. Similarly, they utilize existing exegetical traditions when it serves their purposes.

The texts from the environs of the Dead Sea are not easy to assess because they are so fragmentary. The general consensus is, however, that these do not represent a significant departure from the text which has come down to us as the MT (cf. Milik). Our study supports this conclusion.

The versions are more difficult to assess, even though the entire text of Micah is represented by them. The most important witness, the LXX, presents the most difficulties. This translation shows the most widespread divergence from the MT (if our methods of retroversion truly reflect the Vorlage). Our study indicates that these numerous divergencies between the LXX and the MT represent what appear to be "scribal errors" and not a systematic reworking of the text nor an alternative text-type. One is left to conclude that either the Vorlage contained these numerous discrepancies, or the translator introduced them. The latter seems more likely since on certain occasions where the MT is not in question, the translator clearly introduces an inferior reading (e.g., Mic 1:1).

Tg, P and V are easier to assess than LXX. The translators themselves seem more skilled and, perhaps more importantly, how they view their task is more clearly defined and carried out. We mentioned that the LXX translator had little to emulate when he undertook the task of translating; consequently, his translation lacks a certain perspicuity. The translator gives a literal rendering of his text insofar as he understands it; however, his adhesion to the text

is not highly sophisticated. While he follows the word order, he fails to make distinctions in his rendering of words or particles that would indicate that his adherence is more than just formal structure.⁸⁹ Moreover, his competence seems greater in the receptor language (Greek), rather than the source language (Hebrew).⁹⁰ In contrast, the translator of Tg is an expositor, not simply a translator. He paraphrases, expands, deletes, and otherwise takes liberties with his text in order to explain the significance of it. It must be remembered that the Targumim were intended to be oral, not written, expositions. Presumably, recourse to the Hebrew text would be readily available. (Since for the Greek speaking Jews, and especially later with the Christians, the LXX gained in prestige and eventually was considered inspired, recourse to the Hebrew became less important during this period.⁹¹) The competence of the translator of the Tg in the source language is evident in his recognition of Hebrew idioms and the sophisticated manner in which he paraphrases. V follows the LXX in taking the literal approach. Indeed, we know from Jerome's writing that he was aware of the distinction between literary and non-literary translation (cf. Brock, "Aspects of Translation," pp. 69f.). His competence is evident in the distinctions he makes in the meaning of certain words (e.g., וְיָדָע in 2:6-11). What prevents P from having the perspicuity of V and Tg is its contact with the other versions, especially the LXX. The translator tends toward the literal, which by this time is the predominant method of biblical translation (cf. Brock, "Aspects of Translation," pp. 70, 77 f.). His translation is less formal in this structure, however, often employing Syriac syntax. His competence may be seen in his occasional independent or ad sensum renderings (e.g., 4:4).

CHAPTER TWO

A SURVEY OF THE HISTORY OF THE INTERPRETATION OF MIC 4:14-5:5

Introduction

An investigation of the history of exegesis of a passage is intended to clarify the exegetical problems that arise from the text and to review the various solutions to these problems. It is thus one more tool in the exegetical task, much as philology, historical and literary criticism, and other disciplines aid interpretation. By investigating the major commentaries from all periods, as well as from diverse theological persuasions, it is hoped that a broad base will be laid to carry out a fully-informed, responsible exegesis. Because time and space do not permit an investigation of all pertinent material,¹ we have necessarily limited ourselves to the major commentaries. More particularly, we have tried to be exhaustive on the extant commentaries prior to the Reformation because these are often overlooked. The proliferation of commentaries during and after the Reformation makes the task of examining every commentary all but impossible within the confines of this thesis.

There are various approaches one may take to investigate the history of the interpretation of a passage.² The present study is closely aligned to what Osborn calls the "problematic approach" (p. 45). The questions the commentator himself brings to the text and how he solves these problems are the matters of importance and the starting place for the investigation. Evaluation is necessarily part of any critical investigation, but modern criteria are not

imposed upon those who do not operate under the assumptions of modern critical methodology.³ One may reject an interpretation in the light of subsequent knowledge and methodology, but one may not fault the interpreter for not sharing this by reason of his place in history. This approach allows for development and progress in interpretation without introducing historical hubris or cumbersome teleological implications.

Finally, one cannot investigate the history of interpretation without encountering the problem of what constitutes the literal sense of a text; "There are few more perplexing and yet important problems in the history of biblical interpretation than the issue of defining what is meant by the sensus literalis of a text."⁴ At the very outset of our study we are confronted by the problem in the opposing interpretations of Cyril and Theodore. For Cyril, Mic 4:14-5:5 is clearly a prophetic reference to Christ who was born in Bethlehem and whose origin is from the Father ("from the days of eternity"). Theodore, while accepting Christ as the ultimate fulfillment of the prophecy, argues extensively that the more immediate fulfillment is to Zerubbabel and the return from Exile. Since Zerubbabel was not born in Bethlehem, would not Cyril's christological exegesis be deemed more "literal"? (Cf. Theodoret who singles out the Zerubbabel interpretation of this passage as "contending against the truth.")

R. Loewe observes in his examination of the plain meaning in early rabbinic exegesis that "...what is to be regarded as plain, straightforward exposition is a question to which different periods, intellectual climates, and even individual temperaments will give varying answers: So that we should not be justified in disallowing a claim by early Rabbinic comment to be prosecuting literal exegesis

merely because it conflicts with our own notions of Rationalism."⁵

Loewe's study of the terms derash and peshat led him to conclude that peshat is not so much the simple meaning as the authoritative teacher or by its familiarity with the believing community (p. 181). In contrast, derash is the more experimental phase of exegesis, and may crystallize into peshat if it finds acceptance in orthodox opinion (Loewe, p. 183). Loewe concludes that, at least to the end of the Talmudic period, the simple equation that peshat is the plain sense and derash is the applied sense of a text must be jettisoned (p. 183). Static and dynamic are a more proper distinction.

Thus the history of interpretation, especially in the light of Loewe's study of peshat and derash, may lead to a reconsideration of what constitutes the literal sense--whether we employ the terms sensus literalis, peshat, or theoria (see below)--of a passage. At any rate, this again allows for a development and progress of thought without imposing modern criteria or introducing any concept of a once-for-all solution to the problem of the limits of the literal sense of a passage.

THE PATRISTIC PERIOD

"...As we look closely at the examples of interpretation of the Old Testament throughout the Ante-Nicene period we are no doubt tempted to see only the stupidities, the strange and now laughable allegories."⁶ The Patristic period is often overlooked by modern commentators because of the inaccessibility of the literature and the occasional apparent absurdities found in the writings. Amid the dross, however, is a store of exegetical treasures that can stimulate fresh thinking on old problems.

Two exegetical schools dominate this period, the Alexandrian and Antiochene. The differences between these two traditions are familiar--and they are no more evident than in the commentaries on Mic 4:14-5:5 (5:1-5:6). The Alexandrian school, rooted in Platonic philosophy and heirs of the exegetical traditions of Philo and Origen, discovered symbols of divine truth in the lives and events portrayed in the Bible, and a course of Christian action and theology that often went beyond the text itself. The allegorical method associated with this school was also a hermeneutical attempt to come to terms with a Christian use of the OT. Moreover, it embraces the conviction that all Scripture is divinely inspired and, therefore, historical events teach divine truths, and intellectually offensive passages (e.g., passages with anthropomorphic language and the like) are not to be understood literally.

The Antiochene school, which Wiles characterizes as the "outstanding centre of biblical scholarship and of ecclesiastical confusion,"⁷ built its philosophical framework upon Aristotelian principles. The strong Jewish populace in Antioch also exerted influence upon its exegetical principles. The Antiochene counterpart to allegory was theoria. Confusion often exists over this term (which arose partly as a protest against the allegorical method) since both schools utilize it. Grant clarifies the distinction by saying, "Where the Alexandrines use the word 'theory' as equivalent to allegorical interpretation, the Antiochenes use it for a sense of Scripture higher or deeper than the literal or historical meaning, but firmly based on the latter."⁸ Thus the Antiochene understanding of theoria is closer to typology than allegory. It applies primarily to the prophetic vision, but it also has reference to the divine ordering of history.⁹

In the post-Reformation period, the exegetical methods of the Antiochene school are often embraced as the true precursors to modern critical methodology: "A modern exegete almost feels that he hears a colleague speaking when he finds such insights in Theodore."¹⁰ One should, however, tread cautiously here because, although their deep concern was to root their exegesis firmly in the history and idiom of the Hebrews, their understanding of inspiration and the divine ordering of history clearly separates them from most modern commentators, and places them as true colleagues of their Alexandrian brothers.¹¹

The most serious theological challenge for the early Church was to formulate the relationship between the testaments. This had a practical consideration; if Christianity was in fact the new covenant, why has the old not passed away? (Cf. 2 Cor 5:17). This was no less true for the Jew; why was the sect flourishing so if Jesus was not the promised Messiah? (Cf. Acts 5:38 and 39). Moreover, as Christian exegesis developed and the deeply spiritual experience of the Church became more evident, Judaism had to look afresh at its own heritage to counter the Christian challenge.¹²

The less than amicable writings that survive from this period do not give the true perspective of the coexistence of Judaism and Christianity. At times, the Jews enjoyed a uniquely privileged status in the Roman Empire. As Christian influence rose and pro-Christian policies were adopted, the socio-economic position of the Jews shifted, often resulting in severe treatment and even expulsion from the towns in which they lived.¹³ The polemics did not arise in a vacuum, however, but indicate that the vitality of Judaism continued throughout the centuries.¹⁴ Christian beliefs themselves were often formulated "against the foil of Judaism."¹⁵

Thus the vitality of the old religion caused Christian thinkers to sharpen their theological swords, and the vigour and challenge of the new faith caused the Jews to hone the cutting edge of theirs in turn. One must not forget, however, that both faiths were being formulated against the common background of Hebrew Scripture intersecting Hellenistic philosophy. To be sure, the new philosophical description was adapted to its own special category, i.e., Torah or Christ; it was, nevertheless, Hellenistic.

The four commentators of this period are Jerome (d. 420), Theodore (d. 428-429), Cyril (d. 444), and Theodoret (d. 458). Jerome, one of the most interesting and complex personalities of the fathers, was without equal in the breadth, depth, and versatility of his learning. Jerome's commentary on Micah was among the first he wrote.¹⁶ His method was to set down his new translation of the Hebrew side by side with the Latin translation of the LXX and comment on each one. Each verse is interpreted literally, drawing upon his rabbinic sources, and then spiritually, utilizing the LXX and Origen. Kelly claims that Jerome was aware of the tension between the literal and spiritual sense of a text; "He in general assigns more space to the spiritual interpretation, and at this stage finds it more satisfying" (p. 165).

So great was Theodore's influence in the Eastern Church that later commentators gave him the title, "The Blessed Exegete,"

טורנא (מפסקנא).¹⁷ Theodore recognize the importance of knowing Hebrew, but relied almost exclusively on the LXX (the Lucianic recension; cf. Sprenger, pp. 63f). Theodore's exegesis is marked by his knowledge of historical circumstances of the Hebrews and a clear understanding of biblical idiom. He relates the prophecies

to the situation of the prophet's time; foretelling was part of the prophetic message, but was used especially to encourage the people of the prophet's day. Theodore is no less "theological" than his Alexandrian counterparts, however: "Das bedeutet, dass Theodor in den Methoden des Auslegung, also sowohl in der historisch-grammatischen Exegese als auch in der typologischen, nur Hilesmittel gesehen hat, deren Aufgabe darin bestand, das biblische Kerygma deutlich werden zu lassen" (Sprenger, p. 110; cf. Wiles, p. 492).

Cyril is said to be "the most brilliant representative of the Alexandrian theological tradition" (ODC, p. 369). He firmly adhered to the allegorical method; nevertheless, he also concerned himself with the literal sense of a verse.¹⁸ This is due, at least in part, to his contact with Jerome and the Antiochene school. The literal sense, however, drives its meaning from the thing signified and not from the words themselves (cf. Kerrigan, p. 32).

Theodoret is often overshadowed by the two giants of the Antiochene school, Theodore and John Chrysostom. Although Theodoret knew Syriac and perhaps spoke the vernacular language when preaching, he wrote exclusively in Greek, and his commentaries depend almost entirely on the LXX.¹⁹ Theodoret combines the concern for historical exegesis, associated with Theodore, with the erudition and pastoral concern of John Chrysostom. Ashby argues, however, that Theodoret "was not just a redactor but a commentator, that he did not just touch up previous works but built on them" (p. 3).

The exegetical and theological difficulties of Mic 4:14-5:5 (5:1-5:6) are delineated early in the history of exegesis. The abrupt shift from the promise of 4:13 to the threat in 4:14 (5:1) is dealt with in a variety of ways. Jerome, Theodore, and Theodoret

resolve the difficulty by distinguishing the time of the promises (in the future) from the time of the threat (nearer to the time of the utterance). The difficulty is already resolved for Cyril in the LXX translation which he utilizes (Codex Alexandrinus)--the prophecy refers to Samaria ("Daughter of Ephraim"), not to Zion. Similarly, because the early commentators did not work within a framework of editors and redactors, the shift from the promise of 5:1 (5:2) to the threat in 5:2 (5:3) requires an explanation. Jerome notes two possible interpretations of מְנַחֵם. It could refer to a time of further judgment after the advent of Christ (the promise of 5:1 [5:2]). Or it could have the meaning of caring for the Jews or allowing (permitteret) them to rule until the time of Christ (cf. the interpretation of Eliezer and Ibn Ezra's note on Japhet Halevy's interpretation!). For Theodore the promise of 5:1 (5:2) comes about through the suffering of 5:2 (5:3), as he shows by the idiomatic use of the term for "travailing." He says the verbs ὠδίνειν and τέλειν are often used in Scripture when unexpected divine aid (θεῶν βοήθειαν) comes in the midst of suffering. He quotes Isa 26:18 (LXX) to illustrate this; "Because of your fear, O Lord, we have conceived, and writhed, and brought forth the breath of your salvation which was wrought upon the earth." Theodoret combines features from both Jerome and Theodore. God will be long-suffering with the Jews until the "barren" gives birth, then both Jews and Gentiles will be united. The verse becomes, for Cyril, a reflection on the immutability of God's promises; God will fulfil both the promise of hope and the promise of doom.

The identification of unexpressed subjects of verbs and antecedents to pronouns also occasions a variety of solutions. Jerome, Theodore, Cyril, and Theodoret identify the subject of "he

shall give them up" as God; the pronominal suffix "them" refers to the Jews. For Cyril the pronoun after "brethren" refers to Christ, even though his lemma has the pl. "their brethren" (τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτῶν). For Theodore, who takes the verse as a prophecy of Zerubbabel, the "brethren" are the tribes united once again under Zerubbabel's rule. The one who "shepherds" in vs 3 (vs 4) is Christ for both Cyril and Jerome. For Theodore it is God who shepherds the exilic community through his chosen leader (and the pre-exilic community through Hezekiah). The pl. of the LXX "They will be magnified" (contra MT, "he will be made great") refers to the Church for Theodoret and Cyril ("we"), but for Jerome, who translates with the sg., as in the MT, the Church makes Christ great throughout the world. The "peace" in vs 4 (vs 5) is given four diverse explanations. Jerome and Cyril, probably influenced by Eph 2:14, explain the peace as a reference to Christ. For Jerome it is the peace effected by Christ; for Cyril Christ is the peace. Theodoret says that God gives them peace. Theodore says it refers to the peace brought about by Hezekiah and Zerubbabel.

The illumination of rare terms and difficult expressions is complicated because only Jerome displays any knowledge of Hebrew. Theodore, however, shows a firm grasp of Hebrew idiom. Both Theodoret and Cyril state that the "striking" is a sign of dishonor or shame (ἀτιμία). Cyril appears to be the first commentator to make an explicit distinction between Bethlehem as the name of the town (πολίχνιον) and Ephrathah as the name of the district (χωρος). Similarly, Jerome is the only commentator to mention the differences between the LXX, the NT, and the MT of 5:1 (5:2). He rejects the argument that Matthew was quoting from memory, or that the words were ordered differently. Jerome argues that Matthew intended to show

the scribes and priests the clear understanding of the text. Jerome, Theodoret, and Cyril interpret the phrase "whose origins" as a reference to Christ's pre-existence. For Theodore it refers to the promises of God which he is able to bring about "from eternity." Theodore is the only commentator to recognize the formulaic "seven" and "eight" as an idiomatic expression. He observes that some legends identify the "seven" and "eight" with the prophets and Hezekiah with his administrators (cf. Theodoret). Theodore rejects these interpretations because there are no historical references to substantiate them, and then argues that "seven" is the number of completeness and "eight" is thus hyperbolic. He supports this by quoting and commenting upon numerous passages dealing with sabbath customs, creation, and so forth. Jerome and Cyril relate the expression to OT ("seven") and NT ("eight") "saints." Theodoret sees it as a reference to kings and fighting men, not prophets and apostles.

The fact that Jerome knew Hebrew is well established; the extent and quality of his knowledge of Hebrew is not quite as certain.²⁰ In the commentary on Micah 4:14-5:5 (5:1-5:6) Jerome quotes the Hebrew text on four occasions, and notes the Hebrew meaning behind the two place-names, Bethlehem and Ephrathah. The meaning of the place-names forms the basis for allegorical and homiletical expansion. Jerome ties Bethlehem, the "house of bread," with Jesus, the "bread from heaven" (John 6:22-40). He "explains" Ephrathah as furorem videt because of Rachel's mourning (Jer 31:15) and the quotation of Jer 31:15 in connection with Herod's infanticide (Matt 2:16-18). He later observes that Ephrathah can mean "fruitful" or "bountiful" which, with the "house of bread," further expresses the "mystery" of Christ. Jerome gives two explanations for מִיִּשְׁרָאֵל

and יִשְׁבוּ (jasubu). As was stated above, יָנַם can mean either handing them over to someone else (for punishment), or setting them in a particular situation until such a time when he is ready to deal with them in another manner. Jerome says that jasubu can either mean convertentur (as if from שָׁב), or habitabunt (as if from יָשַׁב). With regard to נְסִיכִי and בַּפְּתִיָּה (baphathee), he gives the Hebrew meaning and the interpretations of Sym, Theod, etc. These interpretations, however, form the basis for allegorical exegesis. Similarly, the meaning of בַּת גְּדוּד, "daughter of robbers," is given with an allegorical exhortation following. Thus, in this pericope Jerome uses his knowledge of Hebrew, almost apologetically, as the basis for allegorical interpretation rather than for the plain meaning. We may also observe that, at least in some circles, נִגְדָדִי was taken to mean "cutting," as in Deut 14:1, and that בַּפְּתִיָּה was understood in the sense of "drawn sword" (as in Ps 55:22). Jerome translates נִגְדָדִי as vastare but explains this as concidere; this is not a "circumcision" but a "cutting" (nequaquam ...circumcisio sed concisio). Jerome's translation of בַּפְּתִיָּה follows that of Aq; ἐν σειρομάσταις, "with a barbed lance." Finally, the vocalization and thus the meaning of יִשְׁבוּ was not settled even by Jerome's time.

The passage was unanimously understood as a messianic prophecy. Theodore and, to a lesser extent, Theodoret arrive at this understanding through their understanding of history, whereas Jerome and Cyril rely more heavily on allegory. Kerrigan argues that when Cyril only gives the spiritual sense of a prophetic text, it represents for him the literal sense as intended by the prophet: "The passages just quoted [from various prologues to the prophets] bear ample witness to our author's conviction that spiritual objects were present to the

minds of the prophets at least on occasion. It seems quite reasonable to affirm that whenever St. Cyril gives but one interpretation of a prophetic text, and that the spiritual one, the prophet was conscious of the spiritual meaning" (p. 220). This allegorical interpretation of Jerome and Cyril became the standard approach to the pericope and performed an important function in preserving the OT in the life of the Church: "But the crucial point is rather this: that through the Ante-Nicene principle of allegorization (gravely imperfect though it was in itself and in its employment) by the time of the Jerome and Augustine, the Christian church's battle for the Old Testament was won, and won for ever" (Alexander, p. 280).

MEDIEVAL CHRISTIAN EXEGESIS

"We approach the subject of medieval exegesis with every desire to judge it in the kindest spirit; but we are compelled to say that during the Dark Ages, from the seventh to the twelfth century, and during the scholastic epoch, from the twelfth to the sixteenth, there are but a few of the many who toiled in this field who added a single essential principle, or furnished a single original contribution to the explanation of the Word of God" (Farrar, p. 245). This derogatory assessment of for whom "the Bible was the most studied book"²¹ is as much a commentary on the author as it is on accurate portrayal of the period in question.

To characterize a period of nearly a millennium under a single rubric is surely a vast oversimplification. The social and political upheavals and the re-emergence of Aristotelian philosophy introduced changes and brought about new reflection on hermeneutical principles. Furthermore, one could not expect to find agreement in defining and refining the senses of Scripture and the relationship

between the testaments among contemporaries of different philosophical persuasions or among those the centuries divide any more than present day commentators agree among themselves or their nineteenth century counterparts concerning the various approaches or criticisms they utilize.

The medieval period does not have two distinct schools, as the Patristic period so conveniently provided. But the period did produce a "hermeneutical divide" whereby the Augustinian distinction between the letter and the spirit became expressed in Law-Grace, OT-NT terms. The effect of this was that, "the sensus litteralis tended to be reduced to the sensus historicus, especially as regards the Old Testament, and hence irretrievably past" (Preuss, p. 269). There was notable opposition to all but eliminating the OT from vital theological reflection on its own terms and not in terms of the NT, yet it was not until the Reformation that the OT was "rediscovered" for its message to the Church.

The period begins with Gregory the Great, whose commentaries follow the allegorical exegesis that emerged as the dominant approach of the Patristic period. The allegorical approach also fits the contemplative lifestyle of the monasteries where the study of the Bible took place. The Carolingian reforms in the eighth century produced new exegetical activity. For the first time in centuries, the concern for a correct text emerged. This was coupled with a questioning of the Patristic exegesis, which continued to dominate any exegesis of the Bible. The Bible was still very much part of the monastic movement, however, so concern for the spiritual sense was foremost for most commentators. The rise of Scholasticism in the twelfth century brought about new exegetical activity, which focused on the literal sense as the true basis for

developing the spiritual sense. The desire to learn Hebrew came with the interest in the literal sense and, consequently, brought Christians into contact with their Jewish contemporaries. Andrew of St. Victor and Nicholas de Lyra are outstanding examples of this activity.

Jewish-Christian relations appear to be sporadic before the twelfth century. With the rise of urbanization, contact became increasingly necessary and this led to an exchange of ideas in the freedom of dialogue and tolerance.²² In the medieval West, Hebrew and the OT were put on equal footing with Greek and the NT as an object of study for the theologian. In the East, pre-eminence was given to the Gospels and Epistles (cf. Smalley, p. 361). The occupation with the OT in the West was caused, at least in part, because of the use of the Latin Vulgate over against the LXX. The tradition of Jerome (and Origen), who sought out the Jews and extended his researches into the OT as well as the NT, was firmly embedded, though not uncritically, in the West (cf. Smalley, pp. 361ff). Moreover, the Hebrew language was considered the mother of tongues and could be learned from a Jewish "neighbour." To learn Greek, one often had to travel. Thus, "The Jew, however despised and persecuted, could put him in touch with the patriarchs, the prophets, and the psalmist" (Smalley, p. 363).

While there may be some justification for Farrar's prejudices towards medieval exegesis, amidst the obvious excesses were the stirrings of life and growth in the exegetical task. As Smalley sums up the period, "The commentator of the early middle ages cut his text, as a mason might cut his stone, into a framework, enabling the reader to focus his mind on the eternal and infinite. By the end of our period he is treating it as a solid background to his

series of pictures from biblical history, pictures which may also be genre scenes" (p. 370).

Five commentaries remain accessible for this period: those of Haimo of Auxerre (d. ca. 855); Isho'dad of Merv (9th century); Theophylakt (1050-1109); Rupert of Deutz (ca. 1075-1129); and Nicholas de Lyra (ca. 1265-1340). Haimo was a ninth century Benedictine monk who taught at the Abbey of Saint-Germain in Auxerre. Through an error by Abbot John Trithemius (who compiled the Catalogus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum in 1492) nearly all the works of Haimo of Auxerre were attributed to Haimo, Bishop of Alberstadt (both churchmen died within a few years of each other).²³

The little that is known of Isho'dad of Merv comes largely from Arab sources. His commentaries, written in Syriac, are famous within the Eastern church and are valuable for the light they shed on the development of exegesis in the Eastern tradition and for the many quotations from earlier commentators.

Theophylakt, archbishop, scholar, and exegete, became the first teacher of rhetoric at the patriarchal academy. Because Theophylakt follows the rich exegetical tradition of the Eastern church and is isolated from the developments in the Western church, his commentaries display a seemingly unimaginative bent. Nevertheless, his commentaries were important in the Eastern church and are "marked by lucidity of thought and expression and closely follow the scriptural text" (ODC, p. 1364).

Rupert of Deutz was a Benedictine monk and a prolific writer. His commentaries follow the traditional literal, allegorical, and moral interpretation of a text. Furthermore, because of a series of visions in his youth, Rupert became convinced that his exegetical works were divinely inspired (WDCH, p. 730).

Concerning Nicholas de Lyra, Farrar says, "But we meet at last with one green island among the tideless waves of exegetical commonplace" (p. 274). His knowledge of Hebrew and study of Rashi (which earned him the title simia Salomonis) made Nicholas de Lyra perhaps the best equipped of the medieval exegetes. His concern for the literal sense over against the allegorical earns him high marks from modern commentators, yet he does allow for the mystical sense when founded on the literal. Moreover, he often quoted Jewish interpretations against the venerated Fathers. He was no mere annotator, however; his commentaries show originality, a clear and brief style, and sober judgment.

The Patristic period delineated the major exegetical difficulties and offered a variety of ways to overcome them. The medieval period is heavily influenced by these solutions. The influence of Jerome on the Latin West is to be expected; however, as the period progresses, his influence appears to wane. This is due not so much to the chronological distance between Jerome and the later commentators as to the changing theological climate and the particular abilities of the commentator. Haimo, the earliest, and most dependent upon Jerome, by and large rephrases Jerome in a compact and lucid way. For example, Haimo contrasts the threat in 4:14 (5:1) with the promises of the previous verse. Moreover, he recounts Jerome's allegorical interpretation that the "daughter of Robber" refers to the Devil "who is always ready to plunder" (likewise in 5:4 and 5 [5:5 and 6] "Assyria" is a reference to the Devil). Jerome's interpretation that the blow upon the cheek refers to Christ's passion is extended by Haimo to refer to attacks against the Trinity (the seige is laid "against us"). Haimo draws on

Jerome for the interpretation of Bethlehem and Ephrathah in 5:1 (5:2); the understanding of שִׁבְעָה in 5:2 (5:3); the reference of "seven" and "eight" in 5:4 (5:5); and בְּפִתְחָהּ in 5:5 (5:6). He adds comments of his own as, for example, when he extends the parallelism of 5:5 (5:6) where "with a sword" refers to the word of God and "with a lance" refers to divine proclamation. However, his interpretation stems from Jerome both in letter and spirit. Knowledge of Hebrew does not appear to be important, and the early theological controversies have settled into a more or less stable orthodoxy.

By Rupert's time Aristotelian philosophy was producing theological diversity over assumptions and method. The Fathers were being reinterpreted; hence, Rupert's exegesis shows more originality. Also Rupert's own mystical experiences give him greater independence. Rupert was, however, a traditionalist, and shows no knowledge of Hebrew, so Jerome's interpretations are valued and utilized. Like Haimo, Rupert follows the main points of Jerome's exegesis, adding only minor refinements. He does, however, call attention to the odd construction Assyrius cum venerit and the alternative reading with Assyriis. If the reading Assyrius is accepted, then the interpretation is that Assyria (the Devil) comes against "us," but cannot separate us from the love of God. If Assyriis is adopted, then God is the one who comes in judgment, as in Mic 1:3. Although Rupert does not otherwise display any knowledge of Hebrew, he recounts an interpretation of the "seven shepherds and eight leaders of men" that is reminiscent of, but not equivalent to, the interpretation in the Talmud (cf. p. 104). He lists Abel, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, and David as the shepherds. The "leaders of men" are Joshua, Caleph, Othniel, Aod,

Barak, Gideon, Jephtha the Galadite, and Samson.

Nicholas de Lyra, who knows Hebrew and is in contact with the Jewish interpretations of this period, need depend upon Jerome even less than the other Latin commentators of this period. He follows Jerome on 5:2 when he interprets **יְהוָה** as God allowing the Jews to live in the land until the preaching of the Gospel brings forth many brethren, both Jews and Gentiles. Overt Jewish influence comes from Josephus on 4:14 where his book, Jewish Wars, provides the historical backdrop for locating the prophecy of siege against Jerusalem. Since Lyra interprets the rest of the prophecy messianically (referring to Christ and his Church), tying this prophecy with the Roman conquest bridges the time-gap and brings coherence to the entire prophecy. Contact with Jewish interpreters helped free Lyra from allegorical interpretation; hence, it becomes more important to locate the fulfilment of these prophecies in a fitting historical setting. Compare Lyra's interpretation of 5:2 as a prophecy of the destruction of the Temple and Jerusalem by the Romans after Christ's death with the interpretation in the Talmud (cf. p. 104) that Rome, the "fourth kingdom," will rule over Israel. Lyra also makes reference to Christian interpreters who interpret 5:1 as a reference to Hezekiah (this may be an oblique reference to Theodore; however, he interprets this particular verse as a reference to Zerubbabel and Christ, and 5:3 and 4 as a reference to Hezekiah). Lyra's rejoinder to such an interpretation is to say, "They judaize more than the Jews," which indicates an awareness of Rashi (and the other medieval Jewish commentators) who interpret this verse messianically. Influence from the NT may be evident in Lyra's comments on **אלפי**, which he interprets as principes (cf. Matt 2:6 Vulgate), and "peace" in 5:4 where he calls

attention to the apostle's words in Eph 2:14.

The Greek commentators Cyril, Theodore, and Theodoret also cast their shadow over this period through the commentators of the Eastern church. The Latin commentators, with the possible exception of Lyra as noted above, display no particular knowledge of the Greek Fathers. Theophylakt steers clear of Theodore (probably because of the stigma of Nestorian theology which surrounded the great exegete), but creatively weaves together interpretations from Cyril and Theodoret. For example, in 4:14 (5:1) and 5:1 (5:2) Theophylakt makes general statements concerning these verses and their relationship to what precedes them, much as Cyril does. He further echoes Cyril when he distinguishes between Ephrathah as the "district" and Bethlehem as the "town" in 5:1 (5:2) by finding its fulfilment in Zerubbabel. Also with Theodoret, he contrasts Bethlehem's "scantiness" with her "notoriety" as the birthplace of the Messiah. Theophylakt is not a mere annotator. He makes independent observations on the text and words, as in 4:14 (5:1) where he makes note of the two textual traditions--"against you" or "against us"--and explains each one in turn. Theophylakt also combats interpretations that emerged later in the Patristic period, as in 5:2 (5:3) when he argues against the interpretations of Paul of Samosatos and Photinus who denied Christ's pre-existence. Theophylakt does not, however, make a reference to Theodore's interpretation of this pericope.

Isho'dad, on the other hand, draws extensively on Theodore and shows little, if any, of Cyril's interpretation. He accepts Theodore's historical and typological interpretation, as in 5:1 (5:2) where Zerubbabel and Christ are seen as the fulfilment of the birth prophecy, and 5:4 (5:5) where Hezekiah and Zerubbabel

are said to bring peace against "Assyria." Isho'dad also follows Theodore's explanation of idiomatic expressions, as in 5:1 (5:2) where "seven" and "eight" point to the complete destruction of the Assyrians. In 4:14 (5:1), however, Isho'dad does not follow Theodore but, because of the Peshitta translation, adopts his own unique interpretation of the initial stichos: The "daughter of mighty troops" is identified as the offspring of "Abraham, Moses, Joshua, and David" who will raid those who lay siege against them. Isho'dad also makes independent exegetical points when, for example, he identifies the "seven shepherds" with the prophets who prophesied against Assyria, and the "eight leaders" as the princes of Hezekiah. Finally, the dependence on Theodore for the literal sense finds tension with monophysite allegory when, after making the point about the idiomatic use of "travailing," Isho'dad goes on to say that this refers to "the Virgin" who gives birth to Jesus Christ.

Throughout these conclusions we have stressed the influences from the pioneering work of the Patristic commentators. This must not be stressed too strongly, however, since OT exegesis was again reviving apart from the NT perspective. This is true of Nicholas de Lyra, and if we had recourse to other commentators (especially Andrew of Saint Victor; cf. Smalley, pp. 112ff.), a more balanced view might emerge. Toward the end of this period, the fourfold sense of Scripture, which had dominated hermeneutical discussions since Augustine, was eroding under the attempt to establish the literal sense of Scripture with theological significance for the Church (cf. Preus, pp. 3-6, passim). This new quest for the validity of the literal sense, together with the study of Hebrew, brought new impetus to exegetical activity; as Preus says, "The best explanation for this recovery of the Old Testament, and for

the theological adjustments that went with it, is that it came about from trying to exegete the Old Testament text itself" (p. 269).

The Patristic period closed with the allegorical method gaining dominance and saving the OT for theological use in the church. The medieval period moves from this allegorical interpretation to new debates over the literal sense of a text; Hubbard sums up this movement by saying, "The allegorical method had developed in Alexandria to save the OT from its Jewishness. Now it was the Jews who provided the means to save the OT from the church for the church" (NIDCC, p. 727).

MEDIEVAL JEWISH INTERPRETATION

The hermeneutical, philosophical, and spiritual problems that the continued existence of Judaism posed for Christianity were no less acute than those posed for Judaism by the growth and vitality of Christendom. Jews, however, also faced the peril of physical harm during this period from over-zealous crusaders. However, "Any general estimate of medieval Jewish exegesis must start from the contemporary attitude to the Hebrew Bible in the context of the dialogue between Judaism and Christianity."²⁴

Bible study by the medieval Jewish commentators grew out of the long-standing tradition that exposition of the Torah was mandated by God: "Now this is the commandment, the statutes and the ordinances which the Lord your God commanded me to teach you ...when your son asks you in time to come, 'What is the meaning of the testimonies and the statutes and the ordinances which the Lord our God has commanded you?' Then you shall say to your son ...And it will be righteousness for us, if we are careful to do all this commandment before the Lord our God, as he has commanded us" (Deut 6:1, 20, 25).

Much as allegory preserved the OT for Christians and provided the key to unlock the alien thought world and imagery of Scripture, so derash provided the means for reinterpretation of biblical laws to meet the needs of the Jewish community. But derash was never given free rein to ride roughshod over the plain meaning, peshat, of a text. These two methods existed side by side until the eleventh century when peshat became the dominant form of exposition. The rise of peshat, and its marked difference from derash, begins properly with the threat of Karaism and Muslim rationalistic theology. This threat was met head-on by the ninth century grammarian and exegete, Saadya Gaon, who did pioneering work in Hebrew grammar and philology. The last great exponent of peshat was the fifteenth century philosopher-exegete, Don Isaac Abravanel. In between these, peshat gained popularity through Rashi, subtlety by Ibn Ezra, and was refined almost to an art in Rashbam, Rashi's grandson.

Rosenthal suggests that medieval Jewish exegesis had a two-fold task ("Exegesis," p. 265). The foremost task was to explain and strengthen the tenets of the Jewish faith. The second task was to defend the faith of medieval Jewry against the attacks by her sister faiths, Islam and Christianity. In the West this especially had reference to the missionary activity of the Christians and the claims of Jesus Christ's Messiahship. As Pelikan says, "Throughout the disputations, therefore, the fundamental difference between the Jew and the Christian was, as one Christian stated it, 'I say, "He has come," while you say, "He will come"'" (Chr Trad, vol 3, p. 253).

Ironically, it was the encounter between Christians and Muslims that led to this renewed interest in the question of Jewish-Christian relations (cf. Pelikan, Chr Trad, vol. 3, p. 246). Since

Christians laid claim to the same authority as the Jews, the use of the same Scripture, the debates raged over the exegesis of crucial texts. Christians argued that they were faithful to the law since they interpreted the text according to the Spirit which leads to knowledge of God, rather than according to the letter, as the Jews did, which only leads to empty observance of the law. The Jewish rejoinder was to pursue peshat to arrive at the Hebraica veritas--which was the goal of all exegesis of the OT: "But it was on this ground of peshat that Jews and Christians met as Bible scholars in a common search for the truth of the Bible, irrespective of their theological presuppositions."²⁵ Historia, the first of the four-fold senses of Scripture, very nearly corresponded to the Jewish peshat.

Anti-christological interpretations of the OT became an integral part of the exegesis of the commentators of this period. These disputations became more vigorous as aggressive Christianity locked into battle with the defensive Jewry who responded to meet the needs of those who faced physical and philosophical harassment. A renewed interest in the doctrine of the Messiah and eschatological themes mirrors the persecution and hope of the Jewish population at large. Amidst this hostility dialogue also flourished, both among the learned and those not specifically trained in theology; the issue had the stamp of daily life. Rosenthal sums up these polemics by saying, "And despite official hostility, there was much personal contact between Jewish and Christian scholars, in a sincere desire to discover the truth of the Hebrew Bible for both of them, as being the Word of God, Holy Writ."²⁶

Finally, the contribution of the medieval Jewish commentators went far beyond medieval Jewry itself. Not only did they influence

the Latin commentators of this period--the Victorines, Nicholas de Lyra, Stephen Langton--but also the Reformers, who fought for the authority of sola Scriptura against both tradition and allegory. The influence continued through the Authorized Version and modern critical scholarship, whose own foundation rests on the scientific study of the Hebrew language and the literal interpretation of biblical passages.

The talmudic traditions preserved in the Yalkut Shimoni and five commentators--Rashi (1040-1105); Joseph Kara (1060-1130); Ibn Ezra (1092/3-1167); Kimchi (1160-1235); and Eliezer (twelfth century)--are examined for this period. The Yalkut Shimoni, or the "Yalkut" of Simon of Frankfort, is a midrashic anthology covering the entire Bible. The compiler is virtually anonymous; references are made to "Rabbenu Simeon, chief of the Preachers of Frankfort" (M. Prinz edition, 1566). It appears to have been compiled in the thirteenth century, but was not widely circulated until the fifteenth. The notation of sources, some of which are only known through the Yalkut, is one of the chief values of this work.

Rabbi Solomon ben Isaac, or Rashi, is the most famous Jewish biblical expositor. Although a modest and simple man, his life became richly adorned by legends. His commentary on the Torah became the first book printed in Hebrew (1475). His commentaries are marked by judicious comments and terse style; no other commentator has wielded so much influence through so few comments on a biblical text.

Joseph Kara lived in Troyes, in northern France, Rashi's hometown. There was considerable contact between the two commentators and Kara may have been a student of Rashi (Kara's commentary

on Micah follows very closely to that of Rashi, often employing the same words). The name "Kara" ("reader") when contrasted with "Darshan" usually refers to one who follows the simple (peshat) meaning of Scripture (cf. "Pashtan"). While not so terse as Rashi, Kara aims more at peshat and utilizes less aggadic material than his master.

Ibn Ezra, or Abraham ben Meir, was born in Toledo, Spain, but travelled extensively throughout his life. His writings show remarkable diversity: poetry, scientific works (mathematics, astrology and astronomy), religious philosophy and, what he is better remembered for, grammatical and exegetical works. His commentaries are marked by both erudition and an effort to get at the plain meaning of a text.

Rabbi David Kimchi, also referred to as "RaDak," became the most illustrious in a family of famous Hebrew scholars. His most influential works were a Hebrew grammar (based upon Hayyuj and Ibn Janah) and the "Book of Roots," a dictionary of the Hebrew language. Kimchi's commentaries are characterized by grammatical analysis, reasoned arguments, and frequent recourse to the Targum. They were later translated into Latin and influenced the translation of the Authorized Version.

Eliezer of Beaugency is a distinguished but almost forgotten representative of the school of Northern French Jewish commentators. His commentaries are characterized by the lack of midrashic materials, and an attempt to follow the sequence of thought from one verse or section to the next. Eliezer is thought to be a student of Rashbam, the grandson of Rashi.

Anti-Christian polemic formed an integral part of the exegetical activity of the Jewish commentators during this period. With the exception of Kimchi, however, very little is said in a polemical way. The reason may be that Jewish and Christian commentators were in basic agreement about whom the passage referred--the Messiah. The disagreement was whether it was fulfilled during the second commonwealth, in Jesus, or whether the fulfilment was yet in the future; cf. Eliezer's comment on 5:1 that the prophecy now turns to the "latter days."

Kimchi engages in a full-scale polemic against the christological exegesis of the passage. His contention is not whether the passage is messianic. Kimchi states categorically that the passage refers to **המלך המשיח**. Rather, his argument is that Jesus did not fulfil this prophecy since he never ruled over Israel. His most vitriolic comments concern the divinity of Jesus, which Christian commentators since Jerome have found in the words, "his origins...." Kimchi answers that the passage does not teach the pre-existence of the Messiah, only his Davidic lineage. Contrast this with Tg, "Whose name was mentioned from before, from the days of eternity."²⁷ Similarly, Rashi cites Ps 72:17, "Before the sun **וְיָחַד** (the symbolization of the messianic name in rabbinic thought, RSV, 'continue') his name," to which Kara adds in his comments the quotation of the Tg cited above.²⁸ Kimchi further argues that even if the pre-existence were conceded, the passage still does not teach the divinity or eternal co-existence of the Messiah with God, because God is without beginning and prior to time. These comments by Kimchi brought heated rebuttals by later Christian commentators; Francisco Ribera refers to him as "that impious Rabbi David." Calvin, however, argues that "the Jews" will never allow a

christological interpretation, and the simple explanation that this is a messianic prophecy will suffice (cf. p. 112).

The pursuit of peshat was also a major concern during this period. Nevertheless, targumic and talmudic interpretations influence the commentators. Perhaps the most important is Tg's interpretation of וַיִּתְּנָם at 4:14, "assemble yourselves" (וַיִּתְּנָם). This interpretation is followed by Rashi, Kara, Ibn Ezra, and Kimchi, though none of them makes reference to Tg. Eliezer departs from this tradition, translating it by "cut yourself" (וַיִּתְּנָם), as it is rendered in other passages (e.g., Deut 14:1). Tg's "Whose name was mentioned from before, from the days of old," also influences Rashi, Kara, and, to a lesser extent, Ibn Ezra and Kimchi in 5:1. In 5:2 the talmudic tradition (Yom 10a) that Israel's distress will be a period of nine months following the reign of the "fourth kingdom" (Rome) is quoted by Rashi and alluded to by Kimchi. Rashi, however, sets his own comments, that it is simply a time of distress, over against this rabbinic tradition (cf. Kara who omits this altogether, but otherwise follows Rashi). Rashi's comments that "gifts," horses and chariots, will be brought to the Messiah (5:3, "He will be made great"), though not talmudic, is a homiletical expansion drawing upon biblical language. This too is omitted by Kara, and none of the other commentators makes mention of it. In 5:4 Kara, Ibn Ezra, and Kimchi comment that the "peace" will be "for us," which appears in Tg (וַיִּתְּנָם). Finally, in Suc 52b the "seven shepherds" are listed as David, in the middle, with Adam, Seth, and Methuselah (non-Jews) on his right, and Abraham, Jacob, and Moses (Jews) on his left.²⁹ The "eight leaders of men" are Jesse, Saul, Samuel, Amos, Zephaniah, Zedekiah, Elijah, and the Messiah.³⁰ This is quoted by Rashi, but not with approval; Kimchi, after giving

the plain meaning, merely quotes "our sages of blessed memory." It appears that, within certain limits, one may move from peshat to derash and back again without rigid distinctions being maintained.³¹

The pursuit of peshat grew out of and led back to close attention to the grammar and philology of the Hebrew language. In 4:14 Eliezer alone mentions the wordplay between גִּדְּוֹךְ and גִּדְּוֹךְ . He also offers an explanation for the change from the sg. "he will lay siege" to the pl. "they will strike." The first refers to Sennacherib; the second is a pl. of majesty, referring to God. In 5:2 both Eliezer and Ibn Ezra comment that נָתַן may have the sense of "preserve" rather than "hand over" (cf. Jerome, p. 84). This indicates an awareness of subtle nuances of meaning in words. It is also a way of resolving the difficulty of words of woe sandwiched between words of weal in alternate verse. In 5:2 Kimchi observes that לַע has the sense of עִם , "with the sons of Israel." In 5:3 Eliezer and Rashi read וַיָּשֻׁבוּ as יָשׁוּבוּן in 5:2. Eliezer comments that they will "return" after the Messiah becomes king and not before, "as some assert." Rashi remarks that כִּי should be understood as אִם , "if," in 5:4. Finally, in 5:5 several comments are elicited by the words and syntax. Rashi and Kimchi take רָעוּ to be from רָעַע not רָעָה ; Kimchi likens it to שָׁבַר , "to break." Kimchi and Ibn Ezra take בַּתְּחִיָּה to mean "sword" (cf. V), whereas Rashi says that it refers to "gates" or "entrances" of her provinces (בְּשַׁעְרֵי מַגִּינוֹתֶיהָ). Finally, Kimchi comments that כִּי in this verse should be read as אֲשֶׁר (cf. Rashi's comments on כִּי in 5:4).

The influence these commentators had on subsequent biblical

interpretation is truly far-reaching. In the English translations of these verses, we can see the possibility of influence in 4:14 (5:1) where the AV reads, "Now gather thyself in troops, O daughter of troops" (both RSV and NEB follow the LXX). In 5:1 (5:2) NEB reads, "One whose roots are far back in the past, in days gone by," which might reflect that the words refer to the Davidic lineage but not the pre-existence of the "ruler" (cf. AV, "Whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting"). Both RSV and NEB read "sword" for בַּפֶּה־חֵיָה (also following V). Finally, AV reads, "And they shall waste the land of Assyria" in 5:5 (5:6), which reflects reading וְרָעוּ from רָעַע, as Rashi and Kimchi argue.

REFORMATION PERIOD

"The Reformers dethroned the Pope and enthroned the Bible."³² But, as Bainton goes on to say, the issue centered on the authority in biblical interpretation. Popes and councils were no longer the final court of appeals in matters of faith; sola scriptura became the rallying cry of the Reformers.

Luther's intense struggle with Scripture broke through the breach and produced the guiding principles for the Reformation. These principles ultimately led to modern critical exegesis. Luther was not the first to wrestle with the "plain" sense of Scripture; nor was he the first to reject popes and councils. The Renaissance produced pioneers in biblical exposition who fought hard for principles of sound exegesis based on historical, grammatical, and philological considerations. Farrar mentions Lorenzo Valla, Jacques Le Fevre, Reuchlin, and especially Erasmus, who at times was Luther's most formidable opponent, as the immediate precursors to Luther's exegetical practices. In our own study Nicholas de Lyra, not to mention the medieval Jewish commentators, broke

important ground in the path that led to Luther. Furthermore, William of Occam had already stated that the salvation of a Christian is not dependent upon anything not contained in Scripture interpreted in a sound, logical manner. But with Luther, timing and personality came together with the necessary force to carry through with what had been brewing for some time.

Farrar asserts that of all the great personalities connected with the Reformation, Luther was the catalyst and driving force: "The genius of Erasmus, and the learning of Melanchthon would have produced but small results without the titanic force of Luther, the sovereign good sense of Zwingli, the remorseless logic of Calvin;--and of these three the greatest was Martin Luther" (p. 323). Luther gave the German people a language, unity, a freedom before God, prayers, hymns, and an example of a life lived in humility before God (Farrar, p. 323). His greatest gift to the German people, and subsequently to the rest of the world, was an open Bible and the means to interpret it.

Many of the issues raised during the Reformation--the question of authority, the role of tradition, the formation of the canon, what constitutes the sensus literalis, and the relation between the testaments--continue to plague biblical studies. Our concern, however, is the exegetical characteristics of the period.

The traditional mode of exegesis, the application of the four-fold senses of Scripture, which had been refined to a fine art during the Middle Ages, was under attack and losing ground. The allegorical method was no longer deemed sufficient in disputations or in the formation of doctrine. For that, the literal sense was needed. Luther and the other Reformers, especially Calvin, abandoned the confines of the four-fold division. This

was not replaced by an exclusively literalist approach (contra Farrar, pp. 327-28, and Kraeling³³). Rather, Luther stressed the clarity and diversity of Scripture, as well as its unity; the history of Israel is also the history of the Church, the lives of biblical personages are also our lives. Exegesis and application were held in dynamic tension, with neither gaining ascendancy over the other. Bainton sums this up most eloquently: "The gain lay primarily in the relinquishment of a wooden schematization, with consequent freedom to roam and soar and indulge in interpretations plastic, fluid, and profound" (p. 25, italics added).

The forces that produced the Reformation were also at work within Roman Catholicism. The Council of Trent (1545) clarified the stance of Roman Catholicism over against the Protestant movement, and set forth the canons of exegesis which prevailed, not without some form of protest, until developments in this century.³⁴

Like the Reformers, the members of the council had to delimit the scope of tradition and Scripture. Unlike the Reformers, the council came to the decision that Scripture and tradition afforded equal devotion. The council rejected the use of simili in place of pari in their pronouncement pari pietatis affectu ac reverentia. The council further reaffirmed the limits of the canon as approved by the Council of Florence (1438). The problem of vernacular translations was circumvented by prescribing annotations to these versions and establishing lectureships on Scripture. The status of the Vulgate was also questioned. A practical solution was also found for this; the Vulgate had proved itself in establishing Dogma (unlike many of the new versions which were found to be heretical); hence, the council upheld its reliability for use in theological teaching and debate. The council did not pronounce

judgment on its reliability to the Hebrew and Greek originals (cf. Crehan, p. 204).

Of those individuals who influenced the thought of the counter-Reformation, mention of first place must go to Sixtus of Sienna (1520-69). Sixtus, a converted Jew, produced an encyclopaedic tome entitled Bibliotheca Sancta which served as a complete guide to the Bible against the influx of spurious works that were being published, "not so much by the malice of heretics as by the greed of publishers" (Crehan, p. 206). In biblical exposition the Spanish exegetes from 1560-1630 produced influential works on Scriptural studies. Among those, Francis Ribera was considered an authority on the OT. Finally, at the close of this period comes the great Baroque commentator, Cornelius a Lapide (cf. p. 116). Thus the Catholic commentators produced exegetical works to rival their Protestant counterparts, but did so within more limited confines and moved with greater reserve.

The three representatives of this period are Luther (1483-1546), Calvin (1509-1564), and Francisco de Ribera (d. 1591). "Much of Luther's exegesis was undistinguished, and even more of it was a product of the exegetical tradition that preceded him. If his reputation and influence depended solely on his exegesis, he might be nothing more than one in a series of exegetical masters--more of a virtuoso than most, to be sure, but not the reformer of the Christian Church."³⁵ However true this may be, seldom has a theologian done so much to give the Church an open Bible and clear principles to guide them in their search for God's word. For Luther the final authority of theology was the Bible and the only principles of interpretation were theological--the sufficiency, unity, and christological testimony of Scripture.

Among the bright stars of Reformation exegesis, Calvin shines most vividly. He was well-equipped to comment on the Hebrew text because of his studies in Hebrew at Basle under Münster and his familiarity with the LXX. However, his mark as an exegete owes more to the brevity of his style and the unpretentious attitude towards the great learning he brought to the text: "Calvin was never diffuse and avoided the mere display of learning; he toiled after clear instruction in the interpretation of the text and edification from it."³⁶ Although Calvin has been criticized for his recourse to typology (from allegory) and his harmonizations of contradictory passages, he is also praised for his criticism of hollow orthodoxy and his views on messianic interpretations (cf. Farrar, pp. 342-349).

Francisco de Ribera was a leading Jesuit theologian of the sixteenth century. He longed to lead the life of a hermit, but was drawn into missionary activity and scholarship. His commentaries display familiarity with the works of earlier commentators and the explication of Scripture along the literal sense.

The three representatives of this period give three quite diverse treatments of this pericope. Luther "spiritualizes" the passage according to certain fundamental principles of his theology and his understanding of the relationship between the testaments. The "promise" given to Israel secures their faith and "Israel" becomes a mirror reflecting the life of the Church. That the passage should be interpreted as referring to a spiritual kingdom, and not a physical one, grows out of the nature of the pericope itself and not as an allegorical imposition upon it. That is, Micah had already prophesied the destruction of Israel (1:6f.) and

God totally destroyed her not long after Micah's prophecy, thus the reference to "Israel" in 5:1 and 2 clearly must refer to a spiritual kingdom. Luther argues that if a physical kingdom were intended Micah would have used "Judah" rather than "Israel." Thus for Luther, as also with St. Cyril, the "spiritual" sense is the literal sense intended by the prophet (cf. p. 87).

Calvin does not follow Luther's exegesis; nevertheless, his exegesis also displays influence from his theology and the circumstances of his situation. The Reformed wing of the Reformation sought to establish civil government upon biblical models; hence Calvin in 5:3-5 finds occasion for parenthesis on civil and church government and the protection God provides through his chosen leaders for the people. Calvin says that the new ruler will be a shepherd "who deals gently with his flock," not a "dreaded tyrant." Furthermore, though the Church may be without a succession of leadership for a time, God will cause that "she may set up a fixed and well-ordered government, and that by the common consent of all." Succession by hereditary right, Calvin says, "Seems not consistent with liberty." [The translator and editor, the Rev. John Owen, counters this remark in a footnote; "It is by no means a safe rule, to draw a conclusion from the spiritual government as to what a temporal government should be."]

Ribera's exegesis likewise reflects the broader theological issues of the times. Like Calvin he interprets the final verses of the pericope as a prophecy of the Church, though his perspective is from the Catholic tradition. Ribera interacts to a far greater degree with the host of interpretations of the passage which preceded his than either Luther or Calvin does. He is not a mere annotator, however, and even Jerome is criticized on occasion

when, for example, he counters Jerome's interpretation that "he will stand..." (5:3) refers to Christ who previously walked (on earth) but who now remains with them always (manebit semper cum eis) by saying that "to stand" means to defend and help (them) from enemies.

The tension between the weal (5:1; 5:3-5) and woe (4:14; 5:2) sections is also variously handled. Calvin comments that the juxtaposition of these sections belongs together in order to prepare the godly to accept times of crises. Luther resolves the tension in two ways. First, Mic 4:14 belongs to the preceding words and refers to Babylon, not Jerusalem. Second, in Mic 5:2 Luther makes a distinction between "them," that is, those of the synagogue who are handed over after the physical kingdom is destroyed, and those to whom the promise of deliverance (the time of childbirth) refers.

Ribera makes no explicit point which would indicate that a tension exists between these verses. The tension in 5:2 is resolved by Jerome's translation of וְיִשְׂרָאֵל, that the Jews will be cared for until the establishment of the Church.

In this period where much new exegetical ground is broken, we also see the rejection of previous interpretations. This is especially seen in the rejection of allegorical interpretations. Luther rejects the interpretation that the "blow upon the cheek" refers to the passion of Christ; yet he interprets 5:1 as a prophecy of Christ's human and divine natures, and interprets "Israel" as the Church and "Assyria" as the spiritual foes of the Church. Calvin rejects the interpretation of 5:1 as a prophecy of Christ's two natures (since "the Jews will never allow it") though, in principle, he agrees with it. Calvin further rejects the interpretation of the "woman in travail" as a reference to the Virgin Mary. However, Calvin does not limit his comments to grammatical or philological

observations any more than Luther does. Where the words warrant parenesis and theological reflection, Calvin does not hesitate to venture forth. This is seen especially in 5:3-5, where he comments on Church and civil government and the previous verses where the juxtaposition of weal and woe oracles elicits comments of comfort and explanation.

It should be noted, however, that it is the nature of the text itself which brings forth these comments more than something imposed on the text. Calvin shows much restraint by not imposing his theological doctrines on a single verse, as in 5:1 where he rejects the interpretation of the two natures of Christ. Luther pays close attention to the words and finds the choice of certain words (Israel, for example) is significant for understanding the text.

Even though Ribera is more firmly grounded in traditional interpretations of the text than Luther and Calvin, he also shows restraint in his comments. He does make note of allegorical interpretations, as e.g. in 4:14 where the "judge" refers to Christ and in 5:2 where the "woman in travail" refers to the Virgin Mary. He does this, however, more as an afterthought and without comment as to its merit, rather than an essential aspect of his exegesis. Ribera is heavily influenced by Jerome's interpretation, as are all the commentators in the Latin West. However, he also departs from Jerome (5:3 especially) as he "untwists" the maze of interpretations concerning the passage.

Finally, with the advance in Hebrew studies we also find more recourse to the meaning of words and grammatical constructions than in most of the exegesis prior to the Reformation. Calvin observes that ^ותָּלַן has a reflexive sense, not a passive. Both Luther and Ribera make comments on the meaning of תָּלַן ; both of whom differ

from Jerome's understanding of the initial phrase by focusing more on the military connotations of the words. In 5:1 Calvin and Ribera argue that באלפי does not refer to the size of the city but to the number of people and hence to the leader of them (cf. Matt 2:5). Ribera argues that צעיר is not a noun but an adverb in 5:1. All three commentators understand the final stichos of 5:1 to be a reference to "eternity," not a long distant past (cf. Kimchi's comments, p. 103). In 5:3 the commentators are in agreement, against Jerome, that ישבו means "to dwell" rather than "to turn." In 5:4 Ribera raises the question of how והיה זה שלום relates to what follows, and again departs from Jerome and V by saying that "Assyria" begins a new thought. Ribera explains the leaders of 5:4 as "bishops" and "doctors," which is essentially the position of Luther and Calvin who argue that this refers to the spiritual (Luther) and civil (Calvin) leaders of the church. Luther says that the numbers "seven" and "eight" refer to a "small handful," whereas Calvin says they refer to "a great number." Finally, in 5:5 the commentators follow the rendering of בפתחיה as "sword" (cf. Jerome and V) but the editor of Calvin's commentary (John Owen) favours "in his entrances" and says that Calvin is following Kimchi and Ibn Ezra.

POST-REFORMATION PERIOD

"The Epigoni of the Reformation were far feebler and less large-hearted than their mighty predecessors...It was only rekindled into brightness by those who were at first denounced as renegades and heretics, but who...were the true heirs of Erasmus and Luther" (Farrar, p. 358). This harsh indictment of the post-Reformation commentators stands in need of qualification on two fronts, even

though the thrust of the indictment--that is, that after the creative Reformation period, the Church entered a period of rigid dogmas and harsh contentions--cannot be denied.

One might well question whether Luther, Calvin, or Erasmus would be as enthusiastic as Farrar is about the development of Renaissance and Reformation thinking in Descartes, Spinoza, and Schleiermacher, etc. The vitriolic pens of these Reformation giants did not spare those of differing opinions during their own era, and one suspects that counter arguments would be levelled against these "renegades" of orthodoxy much as orthodox theologians of the post-Reformation period rallied against what they perceived as dangerous deviations from the faith. It must also be admitted that these renegades follow in the spirit of overthrowing tyrannical scholasticism which enslaves men to creeds rather than worship of God. Certainly the biblical exegesis of Cocceius, Grotius, Spener, and Bengel follows the Reformation dictum Sola Scriptura.

We must also make a qualification concerning the "epigoni" who produced the confessions, systems, and contentions that Farrar castigates. These men were no less the heirs, or bastards, than were the "renegades." Luther, Calvin, and the others swept in like a wave which left an ocean to define it. The epigoni took up this arduous task. Even the works of the Reformers themselves grew from edition to edition as more problems were addressed and clarified (Calvin's Institutes grew from six chapters to eighty in little more than two decades). Thus the confessions, systems, and so forth were the "clean-up" work which needed to be done as the implications and inconsistencies of the creative genius of the Reformers were addressed.

It must also be noted that this new "scholasticism" which, admittedly, hardened the systems of their masters, also evidenced

what still needed to be done in critical-theological thinking. The anomalies that still existed created the unrest which produced a new outburst of creative work in the modern period.

Thus while qualifications are in order, Farrar still isolates the character of the times. His threefold curse aptly sums up this period; "The curse of tyrannous confessionalism; the curse of exorbitant systems; the curse of contentious bitterness" (p. 359). Nevertheless, from both the Renaissance and Reformation, and the rigid systems of this period that were unable to deal satisfactorily with the richness and complexity of biblical faith, the next wave of creative activity broke forth over the Church in the manner of historical criticism in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Cornelius à Lapide (1567-1637), Edward Pococke (1604-1691), August Calmet (1672-1757), Ernst Rosenmüller (1768-1835), and Edward Pusey (1880-1882) are representative of the Christian exegesis of this period. Cornelius à Lapide was a Flemish Jesuit who taught at Louvain and later at Rome. He was highly regarded as a biblical scholar; his clear style and deep spirituality were attractive to preachers. In his commentaries, which cover the entire Bible except Job and Psalms, Lapide gives both the literal and spiritual sense of a text, and makes prudent use of the Fathers and medieval commentators.

The seventeenth century Oxford orientalist Edward Pococke perfected his knowledge of Arabic as a chaplain in Aleppo. He was the first Professor of Arabic at Oxford, and later succeeded to the chair of Hebrew. Through his erudition, he sought to show the faulty reasoning and lack of knowledge that led to many erroneous opinions.

August Calmet, Benedictine monk, historian, and exegete,

adhered to the literal sense of Scripture over against those who made the spiritual sense supreme. Bossuet says of him, "Yet his exegetical works are merely conscientious compilations and lack true critical judgment" (NCE, vol. 2, p. 1084). However, it was through men such as Calmet and R. Simon that much of the biblical exegesis of the eighteenth century was preserved (cf. Crehan, p. 226).

The German Lutheran biblical scholar Ernst Rosenmüller stood on the edge of the great discoveries of the nineteenth century in the Ancient Near East. As Professor of Oriental Languages at Leipzig, he produced the Scholia in Vetus Testamentum in sixteen parts. This work drew heavily upon the history of exegesis, including Jewish exegesis. He also produced another important work, a "handbook" on the natural history of the biblical world, Handbuch de Biblischen Altertumskunde (4 vols., 1823-1831). His exegesis is marked by a concern for the literal sense of a passage, and a judicious use of the history of interpretation.

Edward Pusey was Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford, and head of the Oxford Movement in 1933. He studied biblical criticism in German, but wrote against the Rationalism that he had studied. His commentaries were the hallmark of conservative exegesis in the nineteenth century.

The commentators examined, all from the Christian tradition, show an increased use of Hebrew to explain the meaning of the text. They also display unanimity in interpreting Mic 4:14-5:5 christologically.

There is not, of course, unanimity in every feature that is related to Christ. However, there is a general consensus on major

points of interpretation. In spite of Calvin's remarks to the contrary (p. 112), all five commentators agree that 5:1 is a prophecy of both the human and divine origin of Christ. Pococke goes so far as to say that the "plain meaning" of the words is evident proof of this interpretation. He says that the words, "whose goings forth..." signal "a description of the divine generation before all time," and show that Christ is the eternal son and of the same substance as the Father. He argues that מוצאיו cannot have reference to a future time (as יצא in the previous stichos), but has an implied "preter tense" meaning, "whose origins have been from of old." Calmet mentions that the phrase, "his origins," could refer to the revelation of Jesus Christ to the patriarchs and prophets (cf. Theodore), but his own interpretation is that the prophet is testifying to the two natures of the Messiah. Similarly in 5:2 Lapide, Rosenmüller, Pococke, and Pusey relate the birth imagery to the Virgin birth. Calmet makes note of this interpretation and the ecclesiological interpretation that sees the birth of the Church as the deliverer of the Jews who turn in faith to Christ. In 5:4 the commentators relate the peace to Christ except Rosenmüller who rejects this (he observes that it is Kimchi's interpretation to take מל as a reference to the Messiah) and argues that it is a temporal reference such as מל or מלך ; "This will be a time of great flourishing and fruitfulness." Pococke is the only one who outrightly rejects the christological interpretation of the "strike upon the cheek" in 4:14 as a reference to Christ and his passion. He says that the progression of the prophecy militates against this since the "ruler" is not mentioned until after the calamities of 4:14.

The commentators show various ways to reconcile the Mican

passage with the quotation in Matthew. Pococke's approach is unique (cf. also Calmet). He draws upon Jewish interpretation (R. Tanchum) to argue that צעיר means "great in renown" rather than "least" in this passage. Pococke appeals to Tg and Zech 13:7 in the Syriac and Greek, as well as others "of good authority" (Abu Walid and Arabic). Thus, Pococke argues, Matthew is giving the true meaning by saying "you are not the least." Pusey argues against this interpretation saying that even if צעיר had the sense of "great" it would not yield the sense Pococke wants since להיור implies a contrast in the verse. Pusey himself argues that Matthew is merely recounting the scribe's mis-citation of Micah. Also, this sense views Bethlehem from God's eyes, whereas Micah's text shows Bethlehem from man's eyes (cf. Jerome). Lapidé solves the discrepancy by saying that Matthew is drawing upon a Septuagint text with the μὴ reading. He also states that Matthew had not misquoted from a lapse of memory (as some had asserted). Finally, Rosenmüller argues that the phrase is intended as a rhetorical question which implies a negative answer.

It is only at 4:14 and 5:4 and 5 that any attempt is made to relate this passage to a historical situation in Israel's history; 5:1-5:3 is clearly messianic and thus christological for the Christian interpreters. Lapidé relates these verses both to the Assyrian invasion and then more broadly to subsequent invasions of Judah. In contrast to this, Pococke sees prophecy as having only one fulfillment and therefore the progression of thought is important, not haphazard. Thus 4:14 refers to the Assyrian invasion and the siege against Jerusalem, and 5:1-3 is the messianic promise. Thus 5:4 and 5 must be understood figuratively since this is after the birth of the ruler, and Assyria was no longer a world power. Rosenmüller, like Lapidé, recounts the various possibilities that this prophecy

could be related to the Assyrian, Babylonian, etc., invasions. He is the only one, however, who argues that the one addressed in 4:14 is the enemy (cf. Luther), not Jerusalem. Calmet ties both 4:14 and 5:4 and 5 to the Babylonian and Persian periods. Finally, Pusey completes the picture by locating the fulfilment of the prophecy in the Roman period (he observes that the Jews had no king at this time, only a "judge;" cf. 4:14).

Lapide makes the most extensive use of "spiritual" interpretation. He even goes so far as to liken Micah to parvum (cf. 5:2, Parvulus es), because Micah "is a great prophet but has a small name." Calmet ignores these tropological expositions, as do most of the Protestant commentators of the period. Oddly enough, it is Pusey, who studied biblical criticism in Germany and came at the end of the period, who also makes recourse to spiritual interpretation. For example, in 5:1, he states the meaning of "Bethlehem" and "Ephrathah" to say that what was rich in fruitfulness in this world will be even more fruitful in spiritual blessings. Pococke goes to great length to establish the "plain meaning" of the words (especially 5:1 and 2), but argues that the "plain meaning" can be figurative, as in 5:4 and 5. Pococke argues that these words should be understood figuratively, even as Maimonides confessed and as confirmed by Isa 11:6f, "The wolf shall dwell with the lamb...." Thus in describing the Assyrian menace, who were then the known enemies, the prophet describes an even greater blessing and peace to be hoped for from the "more malicious and potent enemies than the Assyrian or Chaldean, even Satan himself with all his infernal host" (cf. Jerome).

Finally, all the commentators show a knowledge of Hebrew, and utilize it to establish the meaning of the text. Most of their

observations had been made in one form or another in earlier interpretations. However, the proposal of Pococke on צֶעִיר as having two opposite meanings, either "least" or "great," depending upon the context, is a fresh approach to solving one of the difficulties of the pericope. Also, mention should be made of Rosenmüller's argument that בַּפִּנְחִיָּה cannot mean "sword" since this would require a pl. masc. suf. (referring to the "shepherds") and not a sg. fem. suf. Pococke overcomes this by saying that the suffix should be interpreted "swords of it," that is, swords of the land.

THE MODERN PERIOD

"The point is that the direction of interpretation now became the reverse of earlier days."³⁷ With this simple sentence, Frei manages to capture the watershed that modern critical exegesis produced in biblical studies. No longer was it possible to read the Bible without a consciousness of the distance between the biblical world and the historical situation of the reader; "There is now a logical distinction and a reflective distance between the stories and the 'reality' they depict" (Frei, p. 5).

In the pre-critical exegesis, despite the varied approaches--theoria or allegoria; peshat or derash; dogmatic or confessional--the Bible was nevertheless part of the shared, inclusive experience of the "real" world. The interpretation of a text, both literary and historical, and the meaning derived from it were woven "together into a common narrative referring to a single history and its patterns of meaning" (Frei, p. 2). With the rise of historical criticism, meaning was separated from ostensive reference; "Whether or not the story is true history, its meaning is detachable from the specific story that sets it forth" (Frei, p. 6). The rift between pre-critical and critical exegesis began in the post-Reformation

period; "The Protestant writers against Rome were forging the weapons which were soon to be used against them."³⁸ The search for truth was the goal for both the Protestant scholastics and the "renegades and heretics," and reason was the means by which all could agree; "What was disputed was whether, in addition to the natural religion which was common property, there was also a supernatural communication of revealed truth, and if so what were its limits" (Neil, p. 241).

The immediate result of this dispute between natural religion and divine revelation was a Pyrrhic victory for orthodoxy. The traditional view of the authority of the Bible was more or less upheld, but what was previously sacrosanct had now been put in the dock and examined like any other piece of literature. Neil says, "The awe and reverence with which its exaltation into the seat of infallible authority had surrounded it, were soon tarnished in the rough and tumble of debate" (p. 342).

The Orthodox position came increasingly under fire. In philosophy, English Deism, French Rationalism, and German Idealism combined to cast doubt on the nature of biblical authority. With the rise of scientific discovery, geological finds and especially the evolutionary theories of Darwin combined to overturn the biblical story of creation and the origin of Man. Within theological studies, "higher criticism" was casting doubt on the literary and historical integrity of the biblical texts.

The debates stopped short of bloodshed; but reputations were ruined, and faith was challenged. In the midst of the extremes were sensitive scholars who were able to combine the best of modern criticism with the essentials of biblical Christianity. Nevertheless, it was clear that there could be no return to the precritical

view of Scripture; God's Word in Scripture as it was expressed through human authors was now fully recognized. The Bible had become a book to be studied as any other book.

Thus the awareness of the historical and logical distance between the biblical world and the modern world became increasingly evident in the commentaries of the post-Reformation period (this is especially true in the highly apologetic approach of Pusey). Nevertheless, the sustained use of scientific methodology, whether conservative (Keil) or liberal (T. H. Robinson), belongs more properly to the modern period. The gains made by higher criticism and the losses in biblical authority continue to be the blessing and curse of the historical criticism that grew out of the Renaissance and Reformation. The task remains to uncover the right approach(es) to the study of the text in the light of the inundation of knowledge, and to continue to struggle with the nature of biblical authority in the life of believing communities and the pluralistic society at large.

The commentators and the dates and editions of their commentaries on Micah utilized for this study are as follows. C. F. Keil's commentary on the Minor Prophets was translated from the German Biblischer Commentar über das AT by James Martin and published by T. and T. Clark in 1868. G. A. Smith's commentary was published in the Expositor's Bible in 1898. J. Wellhausen's translation and notes on the Minor Prophets was published as Die Kleinen Propheten (1898). K. Marti's commentary appeared in the series, Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament in 1904. The ICC commentary on Micah by J. M. P. Smith was published in 1911 and remains the last full-scale commentary written in English on the Hebrew text. W. Nowack's commentary (3rd edition, 1922) was published in the Handkommentar

zum Alten Testament series. E. Sellin's commentary appeared in the first series of the Kommentar zum Alten Testament in 1929-30. T. H. Robinson's and F. Horst's volume on the Twelve Minor Prophets appeared in the Handbuch zum Alten Testament series (3rd edition, 1964). A. Weiser's commentary on the Minor Prophets appeared in the series, Das Alte Testament Deutsch, in 1967. The commentary of Rene Vuilleumier and C. A. Keller, Micheé, Nahoum, Habacuc, Sophonie, appeared in 1971 in the series, Commentaire de l'Ancien Testament. W. Rudolph's commentary was published in 1975 in the series, Kommentar zum Alten Testament. J. L. May's commentary on Micah is part of the Old Testament Library and was published in 1976. L. C. Allen's commentary appeared in the New International Commentary on the Old Testament series in 1976.

The watershed that marks critical exegesis displays itself especially in the treatment of the unity and authenticity of the pericope. We have seen that pre-critical commentators often noted the tensions between the verses and sought ways to reconcile these tensions. With the rise of critical exegesis, it became apparent that these tensions were often the result of different hands at work in the text, thus isolating these later additions and locating them in a particular historical period is an important aspect of the exegesis of this period.

The whole pericope is often viewed as non-Mican; 5:2 and 5:4 and 5 are further seen as later insertions which interrupt the progression of thought. J. M. P. Smith, Nowack, and Marti are among those who view 5:2 as late; לכך , and the shift from Yahweh speaking to him being spoken of, belie a different hand than 5:1. Similarly, 5:4 and 5 represent another development; the mention of "Assyria" would suggest an eighth century setting (cf. G. A. Smith), but it

is also used to signify Syria and other enemies of the Jewish people in later times (J. M. P. Smith, Sellin, et al.). Since the numbers "seven" and "eight" bring to mind Mattathias and his family, Marti suggests dating these verses in the Maccabaeian period. Keil, G. Smith, Weiser, and with lesser certainty, Robinson, hold a traditional eighth century date for the bulk of the passage. In more recent commentaries, Mays doubts the authenticity and coherence on the basis of stylistic features. Allen, Vuillemeier, and Rudolph (though he concedes that 5:4b-5 could be as late as the Maccabaeian period), however, argue for its authenticity.

The question of authenticity also raises the question of coherence and affinities with other passages. Keil makes note of the logical affinities between 4:14 and 4:9; Wellhausen, J. M. P. Smith, Nowack, and Mays observe this as well, but they also argue for literary affinities, and 5:2 is often viewed as an insertion between 5:1 and 5:3; cf. J. M. P. Smith, Marti, et al. Wellhausen says that 5:1 "zeigt eine auffalende Ähnlichkeit mit 4, 8" which Nowack takes one step further by positing literary affinities. Keil also sees a connection between these verses, but he would reject the idea that the intervening verses are insertions. Finally, 5:4 and 5 are often viewed as a separate literary unit (J. M. P. Smith, G. Smith, Nowack, Marti, et al.), although Mays argues that there are several links of redaction between it and the foregoing. Wellhausen argues that the mention of "Assyria" as a world power does not, of necessity, indicate an eighth century setting for these verses. Even Allen, who argues for its authenticity, suggests that Micah is utilizing an existing war-song.

Historical criticism brought about an interest in dating the prophecies and identifying the historical situation to which they

referred. With all its gains, critical methodology has not, however, gained unanimity in locating the historical allusion of the pericope, especially 4:14. Allen and Rudolph identify this with the Assyrian invasion; Rudolph calls attention to 2 Kgs 18:17ff. and argues that Micah is here in dispute with his contemporary, Isaiah. Since Mays doubts the authenticity of the passage, his own reconstruction ties it to the sieges of Nebuchadnezzar. Still others (e.g., J. M. P. Smith, Marti, Nowack) suggest that the historical situation is not at all clear and resist tying it to any one situation that can be identified in Israel's history. This pattern is familiar throughout the history of exegesis.

Emendation of textual problems is a further characteristic of this period. Wellhausen first suggested the emendation of **וְהָאֵלֹהִים בְּיָמָיו** to **וְהָאֵלֹהִים בְּיָמָיו** and interpreted this as a sign of mourning (rather than banding together as in the Tg). This is followed either in emendation or interpretation by J. M. P. Smith, Robinson, Sellin, Weiser, Mays, Allen, Vuilleumier, and Rudolph. Of this period Keil is nearly alone when he connects it with Jer 5:7 (but cf. BDB and NEB). **שָׁם** is emended to the pl. with **יָנָם** by J. M. P. Smith, Nowack, Sellin, and Marti. Allen and Rudolph, however, object that this is not necessary. In 5:1a **לְהִיוֹן** is omitted as a dittography with **לְהִיוֹן** in 5:1b by Wellhausen, Marti, Sellin, Mays, et al. Robinson emends it to read **לֹא הָיָה** (cf. Matt 2:6 and several Greek mss.). Some commentators omit **לֶחֶם** in 5:2 as a later, albeit correct gloss, on **בֵּית אֶפְרַיִם** (cf. Wellhausen, J. M. P. Smith, Sellin, Nowack, Weise, Vuilleumier). In 5:5, following Wellhausen, the sg. **וְהָצִיל** is often emended to the pl. (J. M. P. Smith, Marti, Nowack, Robinson), though Sellin, Allen, Rudolph, and Mays reject this. Finally **בְּפִתְחָהּ**

is almost unanimously emended or taken to mean a sword of some type, as פתחה in Ps 55:22. Wellhausen raises the possibility of reading בפתחי חרב, but others have not taken this up. Keil argues against this meaning and relates בפתחיה to the cities and fortresses of the land (cf. Isa 3:26).

Finally, in sharp distinction from the post-Reformation period, messianic interpretation of this passage in the Modern period is widely diverse. Wellhausen, J. M. P. Smith, Marti, Weiser, and Sellin view 5:2 as a gloss on Isa 7:14 (note that Robinson connects 5:1 and 3 with Isa 7:14). Rudolph argues that this is a false connection, though he does feel that it is an actual birth, and not a metaphor for suffering and deliverance as in 4:9 and 10. Mays rejects interpreting יולדה in the light of Isa 7:14 (and 9:6); rather, he argues that it is a metaphor for the distress of the exile (as in 4:9 and 10). Keil is the only one to connect 5:2 explicitly with the mother of Jesus. Mic 5:4a is also diversely handled. Marti, J. M. P. Smith and Mays emend the stichos to read "from Assyria." Nowack render it as "und Solcher Art wird der Friede sein," and similarly Marti, "ein solcher." Keil, Allen, and Rudolph argue that והציל refers to the ruler mentioned in the previous verses.

CONCLUSIONS

The following chapter, "The Exegesis of Micah 4:14-5:5," will serve as both the summary and conclusions to the exegetical issues raised by this examination. There are, however, some general observations about the history of interpretation that can be noted.

From the very beginning of the exegesis of the passage

(indeed, even as early as the versions themselves) certain tensions within the pericopes have been felt. The threat of 4:14 following from the promise of 4:13; the change from God being spoken of in 5:1 and 3, to God speaking in 5:2; and the relationship of 5:4a to what precedes and follows, present problems for translators and commentators alike. These tensions are dealt with in a variety of literary, exegetical, or theological ways.

In 4:14, for example, Cyril's lemma represents a departure from the MT. "Daughter of Ephraim" is read, which, Cyril says, refers to Samaria (in contradistinction to 4:13, which concerns Judah). Similar to this is Luther's solution (cf. Rosenmüller). Mic 4:14 is seen as a word against Assyria, not Zion. In P and Tg the word of rebuke against Zion is turned into a word of encouragement. This is followed in some form by Isho'dad, Rashi, Pococke, et al. Jerome, Theodore, et al., make a distinction between the time to which 4:13 and 4:14 refers. Similarly, Calvin argues that the juxtaposition of weal and woe are part and parcel of the divine message; both work to encourage and make steadfast the faithful. It is only in modern critical exegesis that the question of the integrity of the oracle arises. Mic 4:14 has been seen to be part of another oracle; perhaps after 1:10-16 (cf. Vuilleumier), or after 4:9 and 10 (cf. Marti). J. M. P. Smith argues that 4:14 is an isolated fragment of a longer oracle, which is now lost.

These examples, and similar ones with regard to 5:2 and 5:4a, indicate that pre-critical commentators are not impervious to the tensions within a pericope any more than their critical successors. We may fault them for certain exegetical gymnastics, as, for example, the "Daughter of Ephraim" reading in several mss. of the LXX, or P's "Daughter of mighty troops" for בַּת גִּבּוֹרִים of the MT.

However, we need not castigate them for not working within a critical framework of sources and editors. Indeed, we may still learn from our predecessors to recognize, or be sensitive to, the possible links or similarities between originally disparate material. The literary and theological affinities observed by these pre-critical commentators may alert us to the creative genius of the editors or redactors and not just their apparent ineptitude.

What constitutes the literal sense of the passage is another perennial problem. As Loewe and others have observed, the literal sense is not static, but dynamic. In our study, this can be seen within a particular period, as, e.g., between Cyril or Theodore (on the significance of "Bethlehem" and "days of eternity"). This can also be seen between periods; for example, Calvin argues that 5:1 does not necessarily teach the pre-existence of Christ, whereas Pococke says that, "We may not let go the plain meaning of the words...as evident proof of Christ's eternal generation...."

Whatever the literal sense is taken to be, it is usually not something imposed upon the text; rather, it is something that grows out of a close reading of a text. This is not to say that philosophical and theological issues do not influence the commentators. The example of Cyril and Theodore shows just how much these issues determine an exegetical stance. However, it is the significance attached to particular words that gives rise to what is the literal sense of a passage. For example, Eliezer finds significance between the presence of the sg. שׁוּ and the pl. לְכָה in 4:14. The prophet intended the sg. to refer to Assyria, whereas the pl. refers to God. Similarly, Luther finds significance in the use of "Israel" rather than "Judah." He concludes that the prophet chose this word so that his readers would know that a "spiritual" interpretation

was intended. No exegetical gymnastics were intended by either commentator; rather, sensitivity to the possibility that every element in a text may carry significance governs their exegesis.

Thus a history of the interpretation of a passage shows the rich exegetical heritage surrounding a text, and may alert commentators to unexpected exegetical insights.

CHAPTER THREE

THE EXEGESIS OF MICAH 4:14-5:5

There are many interesting and challenging problems in Mic 4:14-5:5 which are both exegetical and theological in nature. The delineation of the pericope itself is a problem, as indeed the structure of chapters 4 and 5 are in general; "Now chaps 4-5 are admittedly the most difficult chapters in the book of Micah in which to demonstrate coherence" (Willis, p. 275).

Willis argues in his study of the structure of Micah that "in their present form [i.e., chapters 4 and 5] they exhibit a coherence which must be attributed to a purposeful attempt to arrange them in an orderly fashion" (p. 227). Willis' study, in spite of significant points of disagreement (cf. Willis, pp. 277-289), is built upon the study of B. Renaud.¹ The analysis by Willis centres on the affinities between the seven (Renaud argues for six) pericopes of chapter 4 and 5: 3:9-4:5; 4:6-8; 4:9-10; 4:11-13; 4:14-5:5; 5:6-8; and 5:9-14. These passages share a description of the present hopeless situation juxtaposed with an announcement that Yahweh will give Israel victory over her enemies or restore her to her former prominence. The forms of the pericopes differ, but each contains this contrasting structure.

The coherence of the pericope 4:14-5:5 focuses primarily on 4:14 and its relationship to what precedes and follows. The tension between these verses has long been noted (cf. chapter 2, "A Survey of the History of the Interpretation of Mic 4:14-5:5"). Those who

do not accept the coherence between 4:14 and the following either argue that it is an independent oracle (cf. J. M. P. Smith), is part of the preceding oracle (cf. Luther), is a misplaced oracle which originally followed 4:9 and 10 (cf. Marti), or perhaps belongs more appropriately after 1:10-16 (cf. Vuilleumier).

One need not accept Willis' analysis of chapters 4 and 5 as a whole in order to accept 4:14-5:5 as a unit. Intentional contrasts within the pericope also indicate coherence. Between 4:14 and 5:1 are contrasts that appear to be intentional and suggest that 4:14 introduces the whole pericope. Willis argues for three such contrasts: (a) between the present "judge," who is treated contemptuously, and the future "ruler," who comes according to Yahweh's will; (b) between Jerusalem, the political and religious centre of Judah, and Bethlehem, an insignificant town; (c) between reliance on military strength, which ends in failure, and reliance on Yahweh, which ends in success. Furthermore, יְהוָה in 5:2 follows from both 5:1 and 4:14, not just from 5:1 (see below). Finally, independent of any affinities adduced with preceding pericopes in chapters 4 and 5, there are unmistakable similarities between 4:9, 11, and 14. All three begin with הִנֵּה and are addressed to Zion ("Daughter of Marauders" is a derogatory reference to Zion; see below), and all three depict a time of distress followed by a word of promise. It thus appears that 4:14-5:5 forms a coherent unit because of the intentional contrasts within the pericope itself and the affinities with the immediately preceding pericopes.

The coherence of a unit also raises the question of the authenticity and dating of the pericope. Although earlier critics had questioned the authenticity of isolated fragments of Micah, it was B. Stade's articles in ZAW² that shaped the debates concerning

authentic material. In the most recent commentaries on Micah, J. Mays follows in the tradition of Stade, that is, that "authentic" material is only found in chapters 1 to 3. There was notable resistance to Stade's analysis,³ which, in the more recent commentaries, can be found in Rudolph, Allen, and Vuilleumier. These commentators find genuine Micah material throughout the book and, as opposed to Mays who argues that Micah prophesied only for a short period of time during Hezekiah's reign (cf. Jer 26:18), they appeal to the whole dating schema of Mic 1:1--that Micah prophesied during the reigns of Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah.

We argue in the exegesis below that 4:14 and 5:1 probably stem from Micah and perhaps arose as a result of Sennacherib's invasion of Palestine (cf. 2 Kgs 18ff.). However, 5:2 and 3 appear to be a later, perhaps exilic, redaction which brings Micah's prophecies into line with those prophecies found in Isa 7:14, 9:6, and 11:1. Finally 5:4 and 5 represent an originally independent oracle of weal which also has been appended to the preceding, probably by the same exilic tradent who appended 5:2 and 3 to 4:14 and 5:1, to show that the nationalism of this oracle (5:4 and 5) can only be accomplished through God's chosen ruler and not according to their own political and military strength.

Numerous philological and syntactical problems confront the exegete throughout the pericope. In 4:14, no agreement on the meaning of **בְּתוֹכָהֶם בֵּית גִּדְדִּי** has emerged since the earliest translations. Also, in 4:14, **שָׁם** is often emended to the pl. Bethlehem in 5:1 is sometimes omitted on the basis of the LXX. Moreover, **צָעִיר לַהֲיוֹת** causes problems for translators. This has been especially true in the Christian tradition, because Matthew quotes this with the addition of a negative particle. Identifying

the antecedents to **ממך לי** has elicited various responses throughout the history of exegesis. In the final stichos of 5:1, **מוצאתיו** has been the source of heated debate and sometimes fanciful speculation. In 5:2, explaining how **לכן** follows from the preceding verse is problematic. The subject of **יגנב** is unexpressed, as well as to whom the pl. pron. suf. refers. Whether the "woman in travail" represents Israel or a prophecy of an actual birth is still debated. Mic 5:3 is relatively free of exegetical problems. The major point of disagreement is whether the root of **וישב** is **שב**, as with **ישובון** in 5:2, or **שב**, as the MT suggests. The enigmatic **והיה זה שלום** in 5:4 remains problematical. Some commentators have suggested that **בארמנהינו** should read **באדמנהינו** with the LXX and as a more suitable term parallel to **בארצנו**. Finally, in 5:5 **בפתחיה** is explained as a lance of some sort, or a fortified barrier. The emendation of **והציל** to the pl., thus making it conform to the other pl. forms in 5:4 and 5, has been suggested. Thus, there are numerous exegetical problems to be resolved in this short pericope.

Finally, the question whether we can properly speak of this pericope as a "messianic" prophecy has arisen especially because of modern critical treatments of the passage. This problem, however, reaches back to the Patristic period, as is evidenced by the comments of Theodore and Theodoret, and, later, in Nicholas de Lyra.

Mic 4:14-5:5 presents interesting problems for the translator or commentator. The present treatment is an endeavour to shed light on the passage by drawing upon the insights and arguments of the entire history of its interpretation.

MT

14 עֲתִידָהּ תִּתְנַדְּרִי בַת־נֶדֶד׃ מִצֹּר שָׁם עָלֵינוּ
בְּשֹׁבֹט יָכּוּ עַל־הַלְחִי אֶת שִׁפְטֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל׃

LXX

ἡνὶ ἐμφοραθήσεται θυγάτηρ ἐμφοραγμῶ,
συναχθῆν ἐταξεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, ἐν ῥάβδῳ πατάξουσιν ἐπὶ σιαγόνα τὰς φυλάς
τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ.

P

(I4) *וְעַתָּה תִּתְנַדְּרִי בַת־נֶדֶד׃ מִצֹּר שָׁם עָלֵינוּ
בְּשֹׁבֹט יָכּוּ עַל־הַלְחִי אֶת שִׁפְטֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל׃*

Tg

14 כֵּן
תִּתְנַדְּרִי בַת־נֶדֶד׃ מִצֹּר שָׁם עָלֵינוּ
בְּשֹׁבֹט יָכּוּ עַל־הַלְחִי אֶת שִׁפְטֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל׃

V

¹ Nunc vastaberis, filia latronis.
Obsidionem posuerunt super nos,
In virga percutient maxillam iudicis Israel.

Pococke says, "It will not be easy in few words to give account of the different expositions of these words which are found in interpreters, or pass judgment between them." The intervening centuries since Pococke make the task no less difficult.

נה : This introduces the addressee: Zion, as in 4:9 and 11. Keil's attempt to drive a wedge between "now" in 4:9 and 4:14 and "and now" in 4:11 is unsatisfactory. All three pericopes are addressed to Zion personified, and each moves from a description of a present time of distress when the nations are gathered against Zion to a future time of deliverance by Yahweh. Thus the waw before נה in 4:11 probably has no exegetical significance; cf. RSV, "Now many nations..." (cf. also BDB, p. 774). The time indicated could be a time ideally present—"then" (cf. BDB, p. 774);

or it could be describing the situation as it stands presently in the eyes of the author--"now." If the historical particularity of the passage has been obscured, as we are inclined to conclude (see below), the former translation is more likely.

יְדַלְגִּי is usually either taken in the manner of the Tg and S, that is, as a denominative of דָּלַג --"Now muster yourselves in troops, daughter of troops" (Schwantes); or one follows the path of V by taking יְדַלְגִּי as a hithpolel of דָּלַג --"Now you will be ravaged, O daughter of the robber" (cf. J. M. P. Smith, although he favours emending the line to יְדַלְגִּי דַלְגִּי with Wellhausen; cf. also Allen, Rudolph, and Mays, "Now gash yourself, O daughter of marauders!")

The diverse treatment by the versions raises a question about the correct text. This is especially true in the light of the LXX which renders the initial stichos, "Now you shall be enclosed (within a wall), O daughter of enclosure." NEB, "Get you behind your walls, you people of a walled city," and RSV, "Now you are walled about with a wall," follow the LXX. Two considerations militate against accepting the LXX as the correct reading. First, the text of the LXX could have arisen through the common confusion between daleth and resh. Although the verb

ἐμφοράσσειν does not translate the root דָּלַג or דַּלַּג elsewhere in the LXX, the noun φράγμος is employed seven times as a translation of דָּלַג.⁴ The noun ἐμφοράγμος is used as a cognate to the verb in order to conform to the Hebrew cognates (Pococke). Elsewhere in Micah the translator of the LXX makes a similar confusion between daleth and resh; e.g., at 4:9 for יְרִיעִי the LXX has ἔγνωνς (רִיעִי; cf. also 2:9; 5:4 7:4 7:12).

Second, the reading of the LXX also seems influenced by the

following stichos, "A siege is laid against us," and conforms to 4:11 where the nations gather against Israel. The understanding is that as the siege is laid, Jerusalem is "hedged in" by her enemies.

The subsequent history of the LXX, and the interpretations based upon it, indicate that these later translators and scribes were dissatisfied with the translation of the Hebrew by the LXX. Some manuscripts (W' A'; cf. Cyril, Theophylakt, and the Arabic translation) have θυγάτηρ Ἐφραΐμ . This is perhaps a confusion with ἐμφοραγμῶ (Melamed), but also reflects the need for a proper noun following "daughter" as in 4:13, "Daughter of Zion" (cf. the Ethiopic text which does have "Daughter of Zion" at 4:14). Sym and Syh are similar to the text of LXX; Jerome comments following his translation, "Hoc juxta Hebraicum, cui Interpretationi Aq. et Sym. et Theod. et editio Quinta consentiunt." Field, however, objects, "Quod tamen dictum cum lectione Symmachi Syriaco conciliari neguit."

An impressive array of commentators have aligned themselves with the position taken by the Tg and P. Rashi likens the phrase to the Aramaic קבצ'י ג'דודין . Similarly, both Ibn Ezra and Kimchi comment that this signifies a קהלה of troops; Kimchi cites Ps 118:12, "They surrounded me like bees," as an illustration of how the "daughter of troop" will assemble. Calvin observes that י'דדג'לל is a hithpa'el (sic) and thus has a reflexive, not a passive sense, "Thou shalt gather thyself." Rosenmüller, Pococke, Pusey, Keil, and G. A. Smith are also among those who take the word to mean "band together in troops." More recently, Schwantes and Willis⁵ argue for this meaning. Schwantes appeals to the versions (Tg, P, and V) and cites Jer 5:7; Willis makes note of the use of military terminology throughout the pericope. Finally,

BDB cites Mic 4:14 and Jer 5:7 as evidence that the hithpolel of תָּלַג can mean "band together."⁶

We must not overlook the fact that both the Tg and P depart in significant ways from the MT. The early translators and subsequent commentators have difficulty explaining the transition from weal in 4:13 to woe in 4:14. The Targumist resolves the tension by turning the word of woe into a word of encouragement, "Now join the troops in camps." Tg omits "daughter" altogether.

Elsewhere in Micah, Tg renders בֵּן as כְּנִשְׁתָּא ; cf. 4:10, "Congregation of Zion" (cf. also p. 27). In place of this is קְרִיתָא , "O Town," as the addressee. Tg deliberately omits the derogatory reference to Zion ("Daughter of Marauders"; see below), which, following from the promises of 4:13, would be out of place. In connection with this is Tg's change of עֲלִינוּ to עֲלֵה , and running the two clauses into one; "Band together in troops, O City, who lays a siege [דְּצִירִין ; alternative reading דְּאִשְׁדִּין (cf. Sperber) "to pour out; shed blood"] against her." Thus in Tg's translation, 4:14 follows from the promise of 4:13; the derogatory reference to Zion is omitted and the siege is no longer "against us," but "against her."

In a similar fashion P transforms the passage. The derogatory reference after "daughter" is turned into a word of acclaim by defining the "troops" as "mighty" (עֲשִׂינָא). Also, in P the troops go forth in a raiding expedition וּנְפִיקִין בְּגִיסָא . As with the Tg, this follows from 4:13. Over against Tg and thus conforming to the MT, P retains עֲלִינוּ but this and the following clause become the reason for the marauding expedition; "Go forth in a raid, O daughter of mighty troops, because (גַּקְמוּ) they have laid siege against us...."

Schwantes argues that V, P, and Tg understand **וַתִּלַּח** as a denominative of **לָחַל**, and proposes that we "do the same." He fails to note the important differences between the versions; while the Tg and P have a basic agreement, V is entirely different. V's vastaberis may be ambiguous in this verse (Willis says that this retains the "military terminology"); Jerome's comments make it abundantly clear that he understands it to be a "cutting" (concisio). Taylor says that vastaberis is reminiscent of 1 Kgs 18:28, et incidebant (MT, **וַיִּלְחֲדוּ**) se iuxta ritum suum cultris el lanceolis.

Schwantes further maintains that the Tg (like the LXX) has confused **לָחַל** for **לָחַל** of the MT (reading **לְחַלְלִי**). However, it is more likely that **קָרָא** replaces **לָחַל**. It seems that a derogatory reference to Zion is consciously avoided. **לְחַלְלִי** (or **לְחַלְלִי**) goes with the following words concerning the siege. Also, by rendering **לְחַלְלִי** as **לְחַלְלִי** the Tg does appear to be taking **לְחַלְלִי** as a denominative of **לָחַל**. In late Hebrew **לָחַל** comes to mean "troop"; cf. 1 Chr 7:4, "And along with them...were units of the army for war." In 2 Sam 3:22 **לָחַל** has the sense of "foray" or "raid"; "Just then the servants of David arrived with Joab from a raid, bringing much spoil with them." Tg then (and P either independently or, more probably, in the same tradition as the Tg) derives the meaning of **וַתִּלַּח** from **לָחַל**. The cultic sense of **וַתִּלַּח** as "cutting" might seem out of place in connection with **לָחַל** especially following the exhortation for Zion to "arise and thresh" in 4:13. Following from the promises of 4:13, and avoiding any derogatory reference to Zion, the Targumist does not take **וַתִּלַּח** in its usual sense of cutting oneself; rather, it becomes a word of exhortation.

The only other occurrence in the OT where **וַתִּלַּח** may not

have the sense of "cutting" is at Jer 5:7. This passage also is not without its difficulties. The Tg has יִגְיִסְתָּ , as in Mic 4:14; P reads אֶבְכַּחֵשׁ , "to contend" or "fight against"; and V, luxuriabantur. Further diversity is shown by the LXX, κατέλυον , which suggests reading יִגְרָרְוּ . The uncertainty of the text as evidenced by the versions continues to the present: RSV, "And trooped to the houses of harlots"; NEB, "And haunted the brothels." Elsewhere in Jeremiah the verb יָטְאוּ occurs with its usual cultic meaning; cf. Jer 16:6, "And no one shall lament for them or cut himself or make himself bald for them." It is not until the post-Reformation period, with Rosenmüller, that Jer 5:7 was appealed to in order to support the meaning of "band together" for יָטְאוּ in Mic 4:14. Another possibility is that יָטְאוּ in Jer 5:7 does refer to cultic practices, as elsewhere in the OT, and that the "adultery" is a reference to heathen cultic rites. Jer 5:7 would then read, "How can I pardon you? Your children have forsaken me, and have sworn by those who are no gods. When I fed them to the full, they gashed themselves in the houses of harlots."⁷

Adultery as a symbol for idolatry and the connection between prostitution and idolatry occur frequently throughout the prophetic literature; e.g., Jer 3:1, "If a man divorces his wife and she goes from him and becomes another man's wife, will he return to her? ...You have played the harlot with many lovers; and would you return to me? says the Lord."⁸ Compare Mic 1:7, "All her images shall be beaten to pieces, all her hires shall be burned with fire, and all her idols I will lay waste; for from the hire of a harlot she gathered them, and to the hire of a harlot they shall return."

It is obvious that those, like the RSV, who translate Mic 4:14a as "You shall be enclosed..." are dependent upon the LXX

which, we have argued, resulted from a confusion of daleth and resh. It is our contention that those, like Rashi, Calvin, Pococke, et al., who translate וַתִּלְלִי as "band yourself together," ultimately derive this meaning from the Tg's misunderstanding and theological modification of Mic 4:14.⁹ This is not to say that they are directly dependent upon the Tg; but that the ambiguity of Mic 4:14 (following from the promise of 4:13) which led to Tg's translation also has led others to adopt positions similar to the Tg's, and that Tg's solution to the ambiguity has influenced those like Rashi, whose own influence spreads far beyond his original audience.

It is also important to examine those who do not follow the tradition of Tg. The most influential of these is Jerome, who, as was mentioned above, explains וַתִּלְלִי as concisio. Although he may have been aware of the tradition preserved in the Tg, he also had recourse to other rabbinic traditions and knowledge of Hebrew. The medieval Jewish commentator, Eliezer of Beaugency, who frequently questions targumic tradition (cf. p. 199), explains וַתִּלְלִי as הִקְרִי. Pococke mentions that Grotius, Abravanel, and R. Tanchum are others who do not follow the tradition of the Tg. In the modern period the German commentators are nearly unanimous in following Wellhausen's lead by translating וַתִּלְלִי as "cutting." Similarly, J. M. P. Smith, Vuilleumier, Mays, and Allen resist the targumic tradition. (Even though nearly all commentators since Wellhausen follow the MT, RSV and NEB follow the LXX).

We have raised objections to both the LXX and Tg; we must now state in a positive manner our understanding of the MT. We

begin with לַחֲמַל , as evidently the LXX and Tg had. V, filia latronis, is the most literal translation of the versions. This is also the rendering of בְּתוּלָה in Hos 6:9, Virorum latronum. The LXX confuses daleth and resh, and renders it "daughters of an enclosure"; Tg omits the derogatory reference, and P defines the "troop" as "mighty." We mentioned that לַחֲמַל came to mean "troop" or "army" in later literature (especially in Chr and Job). However, in earlier literature it is used of marauders or robbers; e.g., 2 Kgs 6:23, "And the Syrians came no more on raids into the land of Israel"; and Hos 6:9, "As robbers lie in wait for a man." There are reasons for taking Mic 4:14 as early, perhaps even Micah. Foremost are the word-plays between בְּתוּלָה and לַחֲמַל and שָׁשׂ and שָׁשׂ (a literary feature in undisputedly Micah passages; e.g., Mic 1:10-16). Furthermore, Mic 4:14 is most probably a word of judgment against Zion; cf. Mic 3:12, "Because of you, Zion shall be plowed as a field; Jerusalem shall become a heap of ruins (RSV)." Thus, just as in Hosea the priests are characterized as robbers (6:9), so also Micah characterizes those of Zion as robbers or marauders. The word-play is formed on the assonance between בְּתוּלָה and לַחֲמַל , and, while there is military terminology in the verse (cf. Willis), the issue is not the siege but the shame and distress of their situation. The leaders of Jerusalem are marauders because they "flay the skin of my people" (3:3); prophesy peace for a bribe (3:5); "abhor justice" (3:9); and "build Zion with blood" (3:10). This behaviour calls forth their judgment ("a siege is laid against you") and humiliation ("with a rod they strike...the ruler of Israel"). Therefore Micah exhorts them to inflict cuts on themselves in mourning, a practice forbidden to the people of God (Deut 14:1). This also may reflect the state of worship in Jerusalem where pagan cultic practices were commonplace, or at least

tolerated. Micah thus employs word-play and irony (cf. Mic 1:16, "Make yourselves bald and cut off your hair") in this oracle in order to show how far the people have strayed from being the people of God.

We have stated above that the prophecy is directed against Zion; we will now give the justification for this. The question of to whom the words are addressed is tied to the interpretation of וְיִתְּנָהּ and the larger issue of the structure of chapters 4 and 5. This is easily illustrated by looking at the history of the interpretation of Mic 4:14a.

Most commentators throughout the history of interpretation addressed themselves in one way or another to the juxtaposition of the promise of 4:13 and the threat of 4:14. Theodore and Theodoret apply the words to the citizens of Jerusalem and make a distinction in the prophetic vision of each verse; 4:13 refers to a time of future glory whereas 4:14 is more closely connected to the time of Micah. This is also the approach of Jerome and the Latin commentators until the Reformation, with the exception of Nicholas de Lyra who ties the prophecy to the Roman invasion (probably for chronological consistency with a christological interpretation of the pericope as a whole). For Cyril and Theophylakt, whose text reads "Daughter of Ephraim," the words refer to Samaria in contrast to Jerusalem to whom the promises of 4:13 are addressed. Isho'dad, dependent upon the Peshitta, comments that it is the daughters of Abraham, Moses, and David who raid those who raid them. Luther says, "I shall be daring and make this interpretation," that 4:14 continues from 4:13 and refers to the "Babylonians" who will be spiritually overthrown. In a similar fashion, Rosenmüller says that the enemy (hostem) is being

addressed; they are to band together to lay siege against Jerusalem. In modern exegesis the similarities with 4:9f and 4:11-13 are noted, and the addressee is almost universally taken to be Jerusalem. Once this structure is accepted and the interpretation of 4:14a is understood to be a caustic reproach of their heathen practices, then the question of addressee follows naturally and the tensions which earlier commentators encountered are resolved on literary grounds and not by exegetical gymnastics. Each of the three oracles begins with a reproach of Jerusalem (Zion) and ends with a promise of her restoration and glory.

The sg. שֶׁם is often emended to the pl. שָׁמוֹ . The German commentators since Nowack are nearly unanimous on this, as also the English-speaking scholars, Taylor, J. M. P. Smith, Schwantes, and Willis (cf. also BHK₃, but not BHS). This emendation is supported by Tg, V, and P, who read the pl. in their translations, and the parallel term יָכוֹן . The LXX, however, has the sg. Recent commentators have resisted this emendation; "This smacks of an easier and so inferior reading" (Allen; cf. also Mays and Rudolph, "die eine Belagerung über uns verhängt hat"). The Masoretes made no systematic attempt to eliminate these anomalies from the text (cf. e.g., Mic 2:9; 6:4 and 5; 7:18 and 19). An appeal to the versions should also be made with caution; the Tg and P are paraphrastic, as noted above, and although V is often literal to a fault (e.g., Mic 1:1), Jerome is not above making changes when the context suggests such changes are necessary (e.g., V has pl. pron. suffixes for the sg. of the MT at 2:9 and at 7:19 proiciet translates וְשָׁלַיִךְ). Furthermore, since the LXX agrees with the MT in this case, emendation on the basis of the other versions is less certain. The indefinite sg. "one has laid

siege..." might be better rendered as passive (GKC §121); cf. RSV, "Siege is laid against us." On the basis of generative grammar this would then be an appropriate or acceptable form to parallel the pl. **יָצַד**.¹⁰

Again the question of the addressee is raised. The historical situation is tied to the critical issue of dating the oracle and also the nature of prophecy itself. Some commentators have resisted tying this to a particular historical situation. Calvin, Isho'dad, Ibn Ezra, and Rosenmüller mention only that an "enemy" has laid the siege. Kimchi mentions "Gog and Magog," which is probably a reference to Assyria (and not an eschatological setting) since he begins his comment on 4:14 by saying that it refers to the prophet's time ("now"). Allegorically, Jerome says that this is Satan's (his interpretation of "Assyria" throughout the pericope) attack against the Saints; Rupert of Deutz views this as the Jews' persecution of God's "prophets, wise men, and scribes" (Matt 23:34) and of Christ ("the judge of Israel") or the Trinity (Haimo). Several options have been proposed for a specifically historical situation. Some see this as the Roman destruction of Jerusalem (Lyra, Ribera, Pusey); others, the conquest by Babylon (Theophylakt, Calmet, Keil, and Mays; cf. 2 Kgs 24 and 25); or finally, the siege by Sennacherib (Theodore, Rashi, Eliezer, Lapidé, J. M. P. Smith, Allen, et al.). Mays connects this with the Babylonian conquest because the language and style is similar to Jeremiah and the word "siege" (**מָצוּר**) is used of Nebuchadnezzar's sieges of Jerusalem (cf. Jer 52:5; 2 Kgs 24:10; Ezek 4:3). In an interesting note Rudolph connects this with 2 Kgs 18:17ff. and 19:8, and sees Isaiah as Micah's opponent here (cf. Isa 37:22-32). Rudolph argues that Isaiah prophesied Jerusalem's deliverance

from Sennacherib's siege because of Hezekiah's prayer to Yahweh (Isa 37), while Micah counters this optimism with the word of judgment in 4:14.

Thus the dating of the prophecy is important if one argues for a specific historical situation. In the present context, the oracle resists being tied to any one historical setting; the focus is on the distress which precedes God's working in a new way through the ideal ruler, who is to come and deliver Israel (5:1, 3, and 5). The historical particularity of the verse has been erased, though the historical occasion which prompted it (if early, Sennacherib's siege; if late, Nebuchadnezzar's) may still be discerned, as also its appropriation in view of later events (Nebuchadnezzar [?] or even the Roman destruction).

Rudolph is probably correct when he says that Micah's solidarity with the people (עלינו , "upon us") goes beyond mere sentiment, as he himself experiences the siege also. עלינו supports an early dating of this prophecy, as also with the use of paranomasia and irony. In decidedly Micah passages the prophet includes himself in the suffering of the people: "For this I will lament and wail; I will go stripped and naked..."(1:8).

It has been recognized since the early commentators that to "strike" refers to shame and dishonour. Jerome's attempt to connect this with the incident when Jesus was struck by one of the officers who arrested him (John 18:22; Matt 26:67) enjoyed wide popularity in the Western Church until the Reformation (Rupert of Deutz went one step further than Jerome and tied this to the whole passion of Christ). Even in Roman Catholic circles this line of exegesis was abandoned by the time of the Reformation (cf. Lyra,

Ribera, Calmet). Several passages illustrate this treatment as a contemptuous action; e.g., 1 Kgs 22:24, "Then Zedekiah the son of Chenaanah came near and struck Micaiah on the cheek"; or Job 16:10, "Men have gaped at me with their mouth, they have struck me insolently on the cheek": and even into NT times, as in Matt 27:30, "And they spat upon him, and took a reed and struck him on the head." Many commentators do not take the reference in Micah to mean an actual physical act; e.g., Theodore says that they will "all but strike you (καὶ μόνον οὐκ)" and Ibn Ezra says that they will do it "in their thoughts."

Again, while most commentators have agreed that this is a sign of great humiliation, they differ widely on the application of the words. Cyril, Isho'dad, Kimchi, and Theophylakt see in these words a general reference to the diaspora (Cyril applies this to the Northern kingdom following the reading "Daughter of Ephraim"). In a rather novel interpretation, Eliezer interprets כִּנּוּ as a pl. of majesty, which refers to God. He says that God will strike Sennacherib and cause him to return to his land in humiliation; 2 Chr 32:21, "So he returned with shame of face to his own land." This interpretation, however, rests on the dubious assumption that the author wanted to make a distinction between the pl. כִּנּוּ and the sg., מָשַׁח (the sg. מָשַׁח Eliezer argues, refers to Sennacherib's invasion of Palestine). Those who attempt to find a historical reference in these words cite the humiliation of Hezekiah by Sennacherib (Theodore, J. M. P. Smith, Allen, Rudolph, et al.; cf. 2 Kgs 18:13ff.), or the sieges by Nebuchadnezzar (Calmet, Mays, et al.; cf. 2 Kgs 24-25). Nicholas de Lyra cites Josephus and connects this with the Roman destruction of Jerusalem

(cf. also Rosenmüller who cites all these as examples).

The dating and question of authenticity of the verse will largely determine which period of Judah's history is reflected in the passage. Allen calls attention to those passages in Isaiah where the Assyrian invasion is described as "striking with a rod." For example, Isa 10:24, "Therefore thus says the Lord, the Lord of Hosts, 'O my people, who dwell in Zion, be not afraid of the Assyrians when they smite you with a rod and lift up their staff against you as the Egyptians did'" (cf. also Isa 14:29; 30:31). If Mic 4:14 is taken to be authentic Mican material, then these passages in Isaiah would be strong parallels.

The historical situation of the verse has been obscured, but what is clear is the word-play and irony intended. As with **יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ** and **בְּיָמָיו** assonance is the basis of the word-play between **שָׁפֵט** and **שָׁבֵט**. Beyond the word-play is the irony; the role of the ideal ruler is to judge (**שָׁפֵט**) equitably: "He shall not judge by what his eyes see, or decide by what his ears hear; but with righteousness he shall judge the poor, and decide with equity for the meek of the earth; and he shall smite (**וַהֲכִה**) the earth with the rod (**בַּשֶּׁבֶט**) of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips he shall slay the wicked" (Isa 11:3-4). In a Royal Psalm we also find, "You shall break them with a rod (**בַּשֶּׁבֶט**) of iron" (Ps 2:9). Allen concludes from these passages that the prophet's hearers, familiar with this language from Coronation hymns, would not miss the irony of the situation; "The venerable judge has become but a whipping boy." The contrast is further brought out in the following verses which describe the promised ruler who is to "stand and shepherd in the strength of the Lord" (5:3)

שפט is variously handled by the versions. V is characteristically literal, judicis. The LXX mistook שפט for שבטי, τὰς φύλας; perhaps influenced by שבת or thinking that "judge" was anachronistic. The Tg has the pl., like the LXX, but follows the MT by reading "judges," דינני. P freely renders it as "shepherd," perhaps influenced by the diverse way the word was handled by the LXX and the targumic tradition. Sym, Theod, and Syh follow the MT. Schwantes argues for emending the text to the pl. with Tg; either the yodh dropped out by haplography or, on the basis of the Lachish Ostraca, the omission of two identical consonants in adjacent positions. More recent commentators follow the MT (cf. Allen, Mays, Rudolph, et al.).

The Western Church since Jerome often identified the "judge of Israel" with Christ (this follows from a general christological interpretation of the whole verse). Even in Jewish exegesis the Messiah is sometimes viewed here; cf. Ibn Ezra who identifies the judge with the Messiah or Zerubbabel. Other commentators see a general reference to the leaders of Israel (Lyra, Calvin, Ribera, Pusey, and Keil). Rashi quotes Isa 50:6, "I gave my back to the smiters, and my cheeks to those who pulled out the beards; I hid my face from shame and spitting;" and says that this refers to the prophets and judges of Israel. Most modern commentators see this as a reference to a king, either generally or to a particular king (Hezekiah or Zedekiah). Amos 2:3 is commonly appealed to; "I will cut off the ruler (שופט) from its midst, and I will slay all its princes with him." Keil argues that it need not be restricted to a king and Pusey, who connects the prophecy with the Roman period, says that it cannot refer to a king, as the Jews themselves said, "We have no king but Caesar" (John 19:15). Pusey's position

is tied to his view of prophecy and is untenable to most contemporary scholars. While שפט need not be restricted to "king," as Keil argues, it seems likely that here, as in Amos 2:3, this is the meaning it carries. At 7:3 שפט is used in connection with "prince" (השר) and "the great man" (הגדול). In the book of Micah, מלך is used only of Yahweh (2:13; 4:7); not even Yahweh's chosen representative is called "king" (5:1; see below). Throughout the book the "heads of the house of Jacob" and the "rulers of the house of Israel" are rebuked for their inequitable practices, yet the king, designated as מלך, is not mentioned among the leaders. Thus שפט as referring to the king is probably intentionally employed, not only for the word-play with שבט, but also to avoid using מלך, which is reserved for Yahweh alone.

Micah 5:1

1 וְאַתָּה בֵּית לָחֶם אֶפְרַתָּה צְעִירִי לְהִיזֹתִי בְּאַלְפֵי יְהוּדָה
מִקֶּדֶם לִי יֵצֵא לְהִזֹּת מוֹשֵׁל בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל
וּמוֹצֵאתִיו מִקֶּדֶם מִימֵי עוֹלָם:

¹Kai sú, Bethleem oikos tou Ephrata, oligostós ei tou éinai én
chiliásin Iouda: ék sou moi éxeleúsetai tou éinai eis árchonta én tῷ
Israēl, kai ai éxodoi autou ánti árchῆs éx hēmerῶn aiῶnos.

(I V) אַתָּה, הָיָה כְּנֶס לְעַם אֶפְרַתָּה. וּבְחִילֵי אַתָּה, הִשְׁמַחְתָּ בְּאַלְפֵי
הַיְּהוּדָה. מִקֶּדֶם וּפָנִים עֲלֶיךָ הִנְחֵם הַיִּשְׂרָאֵל. מִבְּרֵאשִׁית
וְיִצְאָה מִקֶּדֶם מִימֵי עוֹלָם.

1 וְאַתָּה בֵּית לָחֶם אֶפְרַתָּה כְּנֶס לְהִזֹּתִי בְּאַלְפֵי דְבֵית יְהוּדָה
מִנֶּךָ קִדְמִי יֵצֵא מִשְׁחָא לְמַחֲוֵי עֶבֶד שׁוֹלֵטֵן עַל יִשְׂרָאֵל וְדִי שְׁמִית אֲמִיר
מִלְּקִדְמִין מִימֵי עוֹלָם:

² Et tu, Bethlehem Ephrata,
Parvulus es in millibus Iuda;
Ex te mihi egredietur qui sit dominator
in Israel,
Et egressus eius ab initio,
A diebus aeternitatis.

The LXX, the only version to depart from the MT, inserts "house" between Bethlehem and Ephrathah. Several scholars since Wellhausen have argued that even though "Bethlehem" is a correct gloss on Ephrathah, the original text read "house of Ephrathah" (G. A. Smith, Nowack, J. M. P. Smith, Sellin, et al.). More recent scholarship has retained the MT and counted the LXX as the inferior reading; "[οἶκος] ist ein sinnfördernder Zusatz" (Rudolph; cf. also Schwantes, Mays, Allen, et al.).

How the LXX treats the place-names in the book of Micah is germane to the discussion of Mic 5:1 (cf. pp. 34ff.). In Mic 1:1 the LXX incorrectly identifies **המְרֹשֶׁתִּי** as a patronymic reference (perhaps on the analogy of Jonah 1:1 and other introductory formulas) and not as Micah's hometown. Throughout the book it is only the more familiar place-names, such as Lachish (1:13), and not the less familiar (cf. Shittim, 6:5) that are recognized. Also, perhaps germane is the genealogy of the Patriarchs in Chronicles. 1 Chr 4:4 in the LXX reads, τοῦ πρωτοτόκου Ἐφραθά πατρός Β', "The first-born of Ephrathah, the father of Bethlehem" (MT **בְּכֹר אֶפְרַתָּה אֲבִי בֵית לַחְמִי**). Now, while the translator of the LXX of Micah shows little familiarity with the translation of the LXX elsewhere (cf. p. 16), he may well be familiar with the patriarchal traditions preserved in Chronicles. By inserting "house" before Ephrathah the translator is attempting to clarify the reference; like 1:1, he does not see this as a reference to a place as much as a reference to clans (cf. τὰς φυλάς for שָׁפָר in the immediately preceding line!). Thus οἶκος clarifies the personification, "And you, Bethlehem, of the house of Ephrathah" **Χιλιὰς** is the usual translation of the root **חִלָּ** throughout the LXX, but **חִלָּ** may refer to the military subdivision of a

tribe and therefore may signify a clan (cf. e.g., 1 Sam 10:19).

The connection between 5:1 and 4:8, "And you, O tower of the flock...", has been noted at least since the time of Eliezer (cf. also Wellhausen). Besides *אֶתְלֵזֶר* and the personification of the place-name, the verses have in common the promise of a new rule (*מִשְׁלָה* and *מִשְׁלָה*) based on ancient traditions (*מִקְדָּם* and *הָרִאשֹׁנָה*). There is also the sharp contrast with the previous verse; the mourning of the "daughter of marauders" over the plight of her "judge" in 4:14 with the exultation of lowly Bethlehem over the birth of the new ruler.

The juxtaposition of Bethlehem and Ephrathah has occasioned a number of explanations. Cyril appears to be the first to suggest that "Bethlehem" refers to a small town while "Ephrathah" refers to a district (cf. Theophylakt, J. M. P. Smith, Marti, *et al.*). Several commentators suggest that Ephrathah is used to distinguish this Bethlehem from the one in Northern Israel; cf. Josh 19:15, "And Kattah, Nahalal, Shimron, Idalah, and Bethlehem [are the inheritance of Zebulun]" (cf. Kimchi, Calvin, Rudolph, *et al.*). Others have objected to this; Keil says that they are connected "to give greater solemnity to the address." Pusey says that it is a poetic use, drawing upon patriarchal themes. Rashi draws attention to the Davidic motif implied in their use; Bethlehem was Jesse's home (1 Sam 17:58). The identification of these place-names with David does appear to be clear; cf. 1 Sam 16:1, "I will send you to Jesse the Bethlehemite, for I have provided for myself [יָלַד; cf. the following stichos] a king among his sons" (cf. 1 Sam 17:12; cf. also Gen 35:18; 48:7; Ruth 1:2, etc.). Mays suggests that Bethlehem and Ephrathah were family groups whose histories have merged (cf. the LXX!) and

which tradition continued to equate. The meaning that emerges then is this: the new ruler will have his roots in the place and family of David, and, perhaps more importantly, it even reaches back into patriarchal history.

Mays argues that this emphasis on David's place of origin "explicitly ignores the Davidic succession and revises the terms of Nathan's founding oracle (2 Sam 7:4-17)." Mays may be right in what he affirms but is probably wrong in what he denies. The Mican oracle does not deny a successor to David's throne; compare מִמֶּנִּי לִי יֵצֵא, with 2 Sam 7:12, אֲשֶׁר יֵצֵא מִמֶּעֵיךְ. Furthermore, the Mican oracle picks up on a significant part of Nathan's prophecy; "When he commits iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men [cf. Mic 4:14!] with the stripes of the sons of men" (2 Sam 7:14). From the point of view of the book of Micah, the character of the Royal dynasty has so deteriorated that along with chastening, God will reach back to the origins of David's family to bring a new ruler to fulfil the promise to David. Allen argues that there is nothing in the passage that suggests a break with Jerusalem. By the same token, there is nothing to suggest a continuity either. The Mican oracle does suggest a new work by God, but not *ex nihilo*; it is founded on the promise to David. It is also an affirmation that God can once again work through humble origins and is not dependent upon the Royal household.

The words צִעִיר לַהֲיוֹת have occasioned much discussion and speculation. Many have followed Hitzig by "restoring" the definite article to צִעִיר which is thought to have dropped out through haplography with אֶפְרַיִם (cf. Taylor, Wellhausen, G. A. Smith, J. M. P. Smith, Marti, *et al.*). Commentators are also nearly unanimous in omitting לַהֲיוֹת; Schwantes argues that it is superfluous,

disturbs the 3:3 metre, and can be read as a "vertical dittography" from the following line. J. M. P. Smith says that it is merely "poor Hebrew."

The diverse treatment by the versions points to the MT, but also suggests the difficulty they had with it. P has a definite article with "small," but also adds "you" at the beginning of the clause and employs a finite verb for the infinitive; "you are little among the thousands (באלפי) of Judah." The Tg is also somewhat paraphrastic by inserting the particle כ before "small" (in order to make more explicit the implied contrast) and adding לאתמנאח , "to be numbered," after a corresponding infinitive to להיון. The LXX supports reading the infinitive, τοῦ εἶναι, but also adds the 2nd sg. form of "to be" (cf. P). V likewise has the 2nd sg., es, but this is in place of the infinitive. In all these צעיר appears to be the predicate; "you are small...."

The translations of the LXX and Tg imply that a comparison is being made. The use of ὀλιγοστός with the infinitive means "too few," and the clause can be read as a question, "Are you too few...?" since an interrogative pronoun or adverb is not necessary to introduce direct questions in Greek. The kaf of the Tg qualifies צעיר; "whereas (you are) small..., " or "as (though) you are small...." In biblical Hebrew the comparative or superlative can be expressed by an adjective with a definite article (GKC §133f, g), so Hitzig's emendation to הצעיר may be appropriate. However, it is not necessary to delete the final ה on "Ephrathah"; the termination -athah is often found in poetry with feminines, and the -ah termination is found in other place-names (cf. Deut 10:7, אֶתְלֹתָי; GKC §90g, h). Rudolph may be correct to view הצעיר as an attributive here and not a predicate, as in the

versions. We should also note that "Bethlehem Ephrathah," being placed before the verb, is emphatic (GKC §142g).

In other passages, "Ephrathah" is written both with the feminine or -locale ending (e.g., Gen 35:19), or without it (e.g., Gen 48:7). The place-names are closely associated in the patriarchal genealogies (1 Chr 2:19; 2:24; 2:50; and 4:4), the patriarchal narratives (Gen 35:19; 48:7), and especially with the family of David (Ruth 4:11; 1 Sam 16:1, 18; 17:12).

The history of interpretation illustrates even more emphatically the problem of explaining these words. In medieval Jewish interpretation, Rashi attributes Bethlehem's lack of renown to its tainted association with Ruth the Moabitess. Eliezer says that the "ruler" will be small and lowly in the land of his enemies. Both Kimchi and Ibn Ezra explain **רַעַי** in relation to the size of the town.

The quotation of this passage in Matt 2:6 causes the most problems for Christian commentators where **רַעַי** is rendered by **οὐδαμῶς ἐλαχίστη**, "you are not the least." Several commentators argue that Micah's text has an implied "although" (cf. Tg); "(Although) you are the least...(nevertheless) one will come forth...." Theodore, whose lemma reads **μή ὀλιγοστός** says that even though (**καὶ**) Bethlehem looks scanty (**εὐαρίθητοι**) to the hostile nations, it is important and powerful in the eyes of God (cf. Theodoret, Jerome, et al. who similarly contrast Bethlehem in the prophet's eyes and Bethlehem from God's perspective). Others seek to interpret the line interrogatively, "Art thou the smallest..." (cf. LXX; also see Lapide's discussion). Jerome says that some take Matthew to be in error or that he had a lapse of memory; this is vehemently denounced by most Christian commentators.

Mention should be made of Pococke's proposal (cf. Calmet) who builds upon the arguments of R. Tanchum (cf. Abu Walid). He argues that צעיר has two significations ("as many other words have both in Hebrew and other languages, and in contrary senses"); viz. "little" and "great" or "of great note and esteem," and that in Mic 5:1 this second signification is intended. Thus when Matt says that Bethlehem is "not the least" this is tantamount to saying that it is great. This is an interesting suggestion and, as Pococke observes, even more interesting because it stems from Jewish exegesis. However, neither BDB nor Jastrow cite instances where צעיר (זעיר) can mean "great" or "of great esteem." Pococke calls attention especially to Zech 13:7 in the LXX and P. Several mss. of the LXX read τούς ποιμένους for הצירים (W, Syh^{mg}); others read τούς μικρούς (B, S); and still others τούς μικρούς ποιμένους (L' Th., Tht.). P reads עליא "pastor," "bishop," which would suggest dependence on the LXX, τούς ποιμένους. Are the LXX and P faithful to their Vorlage, or are they translating ad sensum? Has the shepherd imagery throughout the verse influenced the rendering of הצירים? At Mic 4:6 the LXX avoids the offensive ואשר הרעני by employing καὶ οὓς ἀπωσάμεν, "those I have driven away" (this is not followed by P). Perhaps at Zech 13:7 the LXX is also avoiding the suggestion that Yahweh would smite the lowly and humble together with the leaders. At any rate, there is nothing to suggest that the LXX has correctly rendered הצירים and the subsequent history of the LXX testifies to this uncertainty, since there is such a mixed textual tradition concerning the word. Zech 13:7 can either mean that the humble ones will suffer the same affliction as the rest of the flock, or that the Lord's hand "against" them may be one of protection. In either case צעיר does

not mean "those of great renown." Finally, with respect to Mic 5:1 and Matt 2:6, even if צעיר meant "great" at Mic 5:1 this is not the same as saying "is not the least" as Matt has it (cf. Pusey). It thus appears that the discrepancy between the Mican text and Matt's quotation is best explained in another manner (cf. pp. 53ff).

It is not easy to disentangle the many possibilities. We offer the following as one possible explanation. First, our study of Matt 2:6 indicated that Matt has neither a different Vorlage than the MT, nor has he had a lapse of memory. Rather, Matt makes an ad hoc interpretation, drawing upon existing exegesis (כזעיר of the Tg) in order to make a christological point; Bethlehem is not the insignificant town it is made to be by virtue of the fact that the Messiah has been born there. Furthermore, Mic 5:1 implies a contrast, as early translations and commentators recognized. Hence צעיר should be read as an attributive adjective (cf. Rudolph); "But you, O Bethlehem Ephrathah, who are little..." (RSV), which may have the force of a comparative (cf. GKC §133f, g). It is not necessary to omit or emend להיוו. The versions testify to some form of היה being present. מהיוו may be more appropriate grammatically to express the comparative, yet we must not overlook the ambiguity and interchangeability in the use of the prefixed prepositions in biblical Hebrew.¹¹ להיוו may have been employed through attraction with להיוו in the following stichos. Furthermore, if we "restore" before צעיר we have the comparative expressed by this construction rather than the infinitive with the preposition. (Also, the ה may account for Tg's כ, and the possibility of the LXX being read

as a question, as well as P's זְעֻרִיָּא).¹² The infinitive then would express the attendant circumstances of the situation; "and you, Bethlehem Ephrathah, who are too small in respect of the clans of Judah."¹³ לְהִיוֹת may well be "inelegant," but one need not resort to emendation or omission.

The versions are unanimous in translating בְּאַלְפֵי literally by "thousands;" the LXX reads ἐν χιλιόσιν ; V, in milibus; Tg, בְּאַלְפֵיָא ; and P, בְּאַלְפָא . What this refers to, however, is variously answered. The NT seems to have read בְּאַל(ו)פֵי, "leaders," ἡγεμόσιν (but cf. pp. 55f.). This is followed by Nicholas de Lyra, Calmet, and Pococke, who adds that a "prince" stands for the whole family. Theophylakt, Rashi, and Keil are among those who say that it refers to the families or clans, and thus is a personification. Others argue that it refers to the number of people (Rosenmüller) or to cities (Kimchi). Rudolph interprets בְּאַלְפֵי as gauen, "districts" (he cites 1 Sam 23:23), and further argues that it is characteristic of God's dealings with his people to use small means to accomplish great ends. Mays follows a similar line by saying that through this procedure God selects an individual to lead Israel, "a procedure which was replaced by the election of the Davidic succession as bearer of kingship." Rudolph and Mays cite Gideon's protest concerning his weak clan and its small size (Judg 6:15). Also cited is Saul's statement concerning his clan (1 Sam 9:21) and David's selection as king; "And Samuel said to Jesse, 'Are all your sons here?' And he said, 'There remains yet the youngest....' And the Lord said, 'Arise, anoint him; for this is he.'" Mays concludes, "The motif emphasizes the marvel of God's intervention, who brings forth a man to save his people from the most unlikely and unexpected quarter."

In sum, "Bethlehem Ephrathah" is probably an archaic, poetic reference to Bethlehem which recalls the patriarchal traditions concerning the families (clans) in the region. The reference to Judah makes it superfluous to say that Ephrathah is used to distinguish one Bethlehem from another. In the light of this, בִּלְפִי is a reference to the divisions of the clans. The theology reflected in this is anti-Jerusalemite (cf. the contrast between 4:14 and 5:1; Zion and Bethlehem). There is also an implied stance over against monarchical succession. The objection by the prophet may be directed more against the deterioration of the monarchy rather than explicitly against Davidic succession, since there are also strong Davidic motifs throughout the pericope and even in the first stichos of this verse (Bethlehem and צִיּוֹן). The argument of the prophet is that God will once again work through unexpected, albeit characteristic, means; he will choose a successor, but he will be of humble origins (as was David), not of the Royal city.

Despite almost unanimous support from the versions (P being the exception¹⁴), commentators have felt the need to emend לִי of the MT. Schwantes, following Fitzmyer,¹⁵ treats the lamedh as an emphatic particle akin to Akkadian lu and Arabic la, and affixes it to the imperfect נִלְפִי . He argues that the additional yodh arose through dittography. The evidence that Fitzmyer adduces for this in biblical Hebrew is scanty indeed (Hab 3:7, sic?).¹⁶ However, the dativus ethicus is a common use of the dative (GKC §119s),¹⁷ and since the versions support this reading, emendation is not necessary. Of greater possibility is Mays' suggestion that לִי was originally an abbreviation for לִיהוָה . This fits well with the rest of the oracle, which refers to

Yahweh in the 3rd person. Again, however, the versions do not support this. Lapidé and Rosenmüller argue that "to me" refers to the prophet (Rosenmüller adds "and the people" on the analogy of "upon us" in 4:14). Most commentators view Yahweh as the speaker (Calvin), or at least that it refers to Yahweh (Marti, Keil, et al.); that is, the ruler comes in accordance with the Lord's will and as a result of his plans (cf. J. M. P. Smith). Mays' emendation would clear up some of the ambiguity; however, very early in the transmission of the text this abbreviation (if in fact it is) was not recognized and elsewhere in the book there are similar anomalies such as this shift in persons (e.g., 4:14; 6:4 and 5; 7:18).

"From you" is almost universally applied to Bethlehem, the most natural antecedent. Ibn Ezra, however, says that this refers to "David and the first kingdom." The indefinite subject of יצא gains his identity through what follows. להיוון introduces the predicate, מושל; cf. Nowack who cites Hos 2:11 as an example of the infinitive introducing the object of the verb, לכסונה אה ערותה (cf. also GKC §114f).

Implied in the comments of both Jewish and Christian exegesis is that יצא means birth or descent. Rosenmüller calls attention to Gen 17:6, "And kings shall come forth from you." Several things suggest that descent is intended here even though it is not used with ירך or יחם. First, the personification of Bethlehem in the first stichos lends itself to the interpretation of יצא ... ממך as birth, cf. Isa 39:7, "And some of your sons, who are born to you (יצאו ממך)." If Bethlehem were not personified, the sense may be as in Mic 4:2, "For out of Zion shall go forth the law." Second, מוצאתיו echoes this end and, although ambiguous,

also has connotations of descent or origin (BDB). The versions shed very little light on מוצאתיו ; P is a literal translation (though it employs the sg. rather than the pl.), ומפקה , "his egress." V likewise has the sg., et egressus eius; whereas the LXX has the pl., αἱ ἐξοδοὶ αὐτοῦ . The Tg, however, attempts to explain this term by saying, "Whose name was proclaimed from the beginning..." The fem. pl. form is used elsewhere in the OT only at 2 Kgs 10:27 (clearly with a different intention). In Micah it gains its significance from the following words, מקדם מימי עולם (see below). Finally, in connection with יולדה in 5:2 the idea of birth is reinforced. Thus the three terms יצא , מוצאתיו, and יולדה reinforce the birth imagery of each other (cf. also that in Matt 2:6 the "birth" [2:4] of the Messiah was predicted by Micah).

The term מושל is rendered literally by the versions: V, dominator; P, שליטא ; LXX, ἀρχοντα (cf. Matt 2:6 where it is rendered by ἡγεμῶνες); and finally the Tg, עביד שולטן, which also supplies משיחא as the subject of "he will go forth." The passage is almost universally interpreted messianically by both Christians and Jews, even though they argue over who the Messiah is; Nichoals de Lyra even chastises those Christian interpreters who "Judaize more than the Jews" by applying this to Hezekiah.

מושל appears to be used deliberately. First, it draws attention to 4:8, ממשלה הרשנה , where Jerusalem is promised restoration to its former glory, and calls to mind Davidic promises. In 5:1 the reference to Bethlehem and the following line, "from of old, from ancient days," combine with מושל to echo and carry forward the oracle of 4:8f. Perhaps more importantly,

מֶלֶךְ is avoided to reserve this language for Yahweh (cf. Mays, Allen). In the book of Micah מֶלֶךְ is used of Yahweh in 2:13 and 4:7. In 4:9 the question is asked, "Is there no king in you?" Might we also see a reference to Yahweh here? The irony with 3:11 where the people say, "Is not the Lord in our midst? No evil shall come upon us" is strong (cf. also Jer 8:19). The use of "counselor" in the following stichos of 4:9 seems to militate against this (cf. Mays); יוֹעֵץ is not used elsewhere in the OT for Yahweh. This does not, of course, preclude the possibility that it is used here of the Lord; cf. 4:12, "But they do not know the thoughts of the Lord, they do not understand his plan (עֲצוּנָה)." Alternatively, "Yahweh" and "Counselor" may not be in "synonymous" parallelism; "Is there no king (Yahweh) in you? Moreover, has your counsellor (the reigning monarch) perished?" At any rate, in 5:1 the use of מוֹשֵׁל indicates the subordinate role the promised ruler plays (cf. 5:3) to Yahweh who reigns over them in Zion (cf. 4:7).

We have indicated that מוֹצֵאֵינוּ should be understood as origin or descent and interpreted in the light of יֵצֵא and יוֹלְדָה. It must also be seen in the light of מִקְדֵּם מֵימֵי עוֹלָם. Since Jerome, Christian interpreters have looked to John 1:1 as a parallel and interpreted these words as a reference to the pre-existence of Christ. Rupert of Deutz argues that 5:1 teaches both the human birth of Christ at Bethlehem (יָצָא) and his spiritual descent from the Father in eternity (מוֹצֵאֵינוּ). Calvin, though accepting the doctrine of Christ's pre-existence, rejects this interpretation of 5:1 as forced. Cyril relates these words to Christ's unique relationship to the Father (John 14:6). Theodore, followed by Isho'dad, departs from these christological interpretations by relating the words to the promises made to David and

Abraham. Medieval Jewish commentators are also diverse in their interpretations. Rashi and Kara rely on the Tg ("whose name was revealed from long ago"); Rashi cites Ps 72:17 where יְנוּן , the symbolization of the Messiah's name in rabbinic though, occurs. Ibn Ezra, in a more philosophical vein, talks of the priority of the existence of the Messiah over against time since time was created after "eternity." Kimchi and Eliezer take the view that antiquity, not eternity, is meant here, and that the messianic descent from David's lineage is to be understood. This is the view that has prevailed since the Reformation, though Ribera, Calmet, Pococke, and Pusey follow the older view of Jerome.

Much ink has been spilled over the significance of מְקֵדָם. Pococke insists that the "plain meaning" of these words refers to eternity; he says they "sometimes signify, the first, 'time long since,' and the latter, 'long duration of time,' whether past or to come; so they also signify 'eternity,' of 'days and time.'" He quotes Prov 8:22 and 23, "The Lord created me at the beginning of his work, the first of his acts of old (מֵאֲדָמָה...מֵרֵאשִׁית); ages ago (מֵעוֹלָם) I was set up, at the first, before the beginning of the earth (מִקְדָּמִי אֶרֶץ)." He concludes that if these words mean "eternity" when used alone, how much more do they signify eternity when they are used together. However, J. Barr's study of עוֹלָם and other words of time,¹⁸ based on modern philological principles, leads him to conclude that "The word 'olam' refers to the remotest time, or means 'perpetuity'" (p. 123). He further makes note of the difficulty in arguing that עוֹלָם signifies eternity in Biblical Hebrew; "There are few, or perhaps no, examples of a sense 'eternity' in a free syntactical context such as 'eternity is like so and so' or 'I am thinking

about eternity'" (p. 124). By the time of the Tg "eternity" may be the accepted interpretation of this and similar passages; however, in Biblical Hebrew there appears to be no unambiguous example of this.

If we look at these words in the light of the entire verse and modern philological studies, the idea of remote time makes good sense. That is, the patriarchal traditions have been alluded to in the use of "Bethlehem Ephrathah" and "clans" (באלפי), and thus "whose origin is from of old..." reinforces the antiquity of his lineage through the house of David. It implies both continuity with the past, and discontinuity with Royal succession (cf. Isa 11:1). In speaking of both Isa 11:1 and Mic 5:1 Gerhard von Rad remarks, "The reference to the father of David makes it probable that Isaiah is not thinking simply of any future anointed one seated on the throne of David, but of a new David, at whose advent Yahweh will restore the glory of the original Davidic empire."¹⁹ Mention should also be made of Mic 7:20 where promises to the patriarchs, Abraham and Jacob, are said to be from "the days of old" (מימי קדם).

Micah 5:2

לְכֵן יִחְיֶה עַד-עַתָּה יוֹלְדָה יִלְדָּה
וַיֵּתֶר אֶחָיו יִשְׁבֹּן עַל-בִּגְדֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל:

MT

^{*διὰ τοῦτο}
δώσει αὐτοὺς ἕως καιροῦ τρυφῆς τέξεται, καὶ οἱ ἐπίλοιποι τῶν
ἀδελφῶν αὐτῶν ἐπιστρέψουσιν ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραὴλ.

LXX

(2) חבב בלח אה בורח לוכא

P

והוא בלח אה. סזכא גאזא, חבב בלח לוכא בורח אה

³ Propter hoc dabit eos usque ad tempus
in quo parturiens pariet;
Et reliquiae fratrum eius convertentur ad
filios Israel.

V

This verse comes as a parenthetic statement between the promise of the ruler in 5:1 and a description of his rule in 5:3. "Therefore," לִכֵּן, in prophetic literature usually introduces a divine declaration of the consequences which follow from egregious behaviour; e.g., Amos 4:12, "Therefore, thus I will do to you, O Israel; because I will do this to you, prepare to meet your God, O Israel!" This meaning is inappropriate here. Schwantes opts for emendation by omitting לִכֵּן; Mays suggests that it is an explanation of the delay of the promised ruler; Allen argues that it marks a transition from divine promise to prophetic application (he cites the change from Yahweh speaking in 5:1 to the prophet speaking in 5:2).

The versions indicate that they also felt a tension between the following words and the preceding. The LXX and V are literal. The Tg translates the active יִתְּנוּם by the passive or reflexive יִתְמַסְרוּן, "They will be handed over." This may be merely stylistic, but it may also indicate a reluctance to attribute the abandonment of the people by the promised Messiah (if he is understood as the subject of "he will give them over") or Yahweh. In a similar fashion, P translates לִכֵּן by "now" (מְכִיל), the same word he uses in 4:14 for וְעַתָּה. This probably reflects the difficulty the translator had with rendering לִכֵּן. The "delivering over" is not a consequence of some action, but a more explicitly temporal reference; "Now he will deliver them over until the time...." The Arabic translation (which otherwise follows the LXX) translates יִתְּנוּם by the 2nd. fem. sg., making

Bethlehem Ephrathah, or the travelling woman, the subject.

In the history of exegesis St. Cyril resolves the difficulty by arguing that the prophet turns his thoughts to the present situation, from the preceding words of future promise, to reflect on the immutability of God to carry out both his threats and promises. Calvin comments on the juxtaposition of weal and woe and says that "he wished then here to prepare the minds of the godly to bear evils." Nowack says that "therefore" refers to 5:1, but that it hardly follows from it.

Another solution, mentioned by Jerome and Ibn Ezra and argued for by Eliezer, is that **וְהָיָה** does not signify "handing over" but refers to allowing the people to go into exile (under divine care) until the time of deliverance. Eliezer says **וְהָיָה שְׁבִי** "he will put, that is, set his people at rest in the exile, in the land of his captors."

וְהָיָה does carry the sense of "permit" in some contexts; e.g., Gen 20:6, "Therefore I did not let you touch her." It may also have the sense of "commit" or "entrust," as in 2 Sam 10:10, "The rest of the men he put in the charge of Abishai his brother." And Gen 30:35, "But that day Laban removed the he-goats that were striped and spotted...and put them in charge of his sons." If **וְהָיָה** has this sense in Mic 5:2, as Jerome and Eliezer suggest, a suitable indirect object is needed; "He will entrust them to his care," which may be better rendered as a passive, "They will be in his care." It is often necessary to supply a predicate or object in biblical Hebrew; e.g., Mic 5:3, "He shall stand and shepherd his flock..." (RSV). Even if **וְהָיָה** has the sense of "to hand over," an indirect object is still implied; "He will hand them over to their enemies." The usual idiom for this use of

ָּ is ַּ ; e.g., Judg 4:7, "And I will give him into your hand."

The interpretation of ָּ as "permit" or "entrust" has several advantages. First, ַּ would then have the more natural sense of introducing a consequence of the foregoing. After the promise of the ruler, God will take charge of them, even in the dire circumstances of the siege (or exile), until the time of deliverance. "Therefore" follows from the promise. Moreover, the sequence of thought is not interrupted; threat (4:14) is followed by promise (5:1) and then further promise and reassurance (5:2). Finally, the birth imagery of 5:2 follows from the promise of a birth in 5:1 (ַּ) and "Israel" is likewise carried over in 5:2b.

However, this is not without its difficulties. The phrase beginning "he will give..." appears to be from a different hand than the author of 4:14 and 5:1. This is suggested by the "prophet" disassociating himself from the people (in 4:14 the siege comes "upon us," whereas in 5:2 "he" will give "them" over). Also, in 5:1 Yahweh is speaking, whereas in 5:2 he is referred to in the 3rd person. Finally, the language is reminiscent of 4:10 where Zion is in travail and the people will be brought back from exile. Thus it may be a forced interpretation to take ָּ in the sense of "permit" or "entrust"; the continuity with the preceding may only be apparent and not the intent of the redaction.

Taking ָּ in the traditional interpretation of "handing over," Mays argues that this verse is an apologetic for the delay of the promised ruler, and depicts the deliverance as a work of Yahweh and not the work of the ruler. This latter statement

needs to be qualified. Throughout the pericope the ruler is subordinate to Yahweh (5:3) and only comes in accordance with his plans (5:1). Thus it seems to be a false dichotomy to drive a wedge between the work of Yahweh and the work of the ruler; the ruler works on Yahweh's behalf and is himself part of that deliverance by Yahweh (5:1, 3, and 5). The phrase, "He shall hand them over," does recall 4:14 and 4:9 and 10, but this comes as encouragement to those who are handed over since the time of distress is short or limited ("until the time..."). Then the promise of 5:1 comes, to which "the woman in travail..." alludes (אֵלֶּיךָ and מִלְּפָנֶיךָ). This also brings to mind the prophecies of Isa 7:14 and 9:6. Only secondarily are the prophecies of 4:9 and 10 in view (contra Mays; see below). Mays is correct when he says that this also introduces the motif of "remnant." כֵּן thus bridges the time between 4:14 and 5:1 (cf. Rudolph).

The verse appears to be an apologetic from exilic times (in the tradition of deutero-Isaiah?). It comes as an encouragement to those who experience the threat of 4:14, that the promise of 5:1 will surely follow. וְיָדָע acknowledges Micah's word of judgment ("He will hand them over"), but is followed by the promise that a remnant shall be preserved out of the distress (echoes of 4:9 and 10) when the promised ruler leads them back ("his brethren shall return..."). This redaction brings Micah's prophecy into line with a messianic interpretation of Isa 7:14; 9:6; and 11:1, and further precludes taking וְיָדָע in the sense of "entrusting" or "permitting."

The phrase, "when she who is in travail has brought forth," has occasioned much debate. The versions are literal; even the Tg does not offer an explanation as he is wont to do with metaphors

(cf. pp. 28f.; he is also literal at 4:9 and 10). The participle יולדה is the subject of the finite verb; cf. Amos 9:1 אֶל-יְנוּסָם, להם נס, "not one of them shall flee away" (cf. Rudolph, GKC §116w). The exegetical question is whether the words should be taken metaphorically or literally.

Many distinguished commentators adhere to the view that יולדה יולדה should be taken metaphorically. Theodore observes that ὤδινεν and τέκεν in the LXX are idioms for unexpected divine deliverance in the midst of distress. This line of interpretation is also taken by Isho'dad (who also relates it to the virgin birth), Calvin, Kimchi, Eliezer, Mays, et al. Similar to this is Theodoret's interpretation that the Church will be born out of the barren gentiles (cf. Isa 54:1; Luther, Ribera, et al.).

There are some differences, however, between the use of the words in 5:1 and their use in 4:9 and 10. In 4:10 Zion is personified, as Bethlehem is in 5:1; however, the subject of 5:2 is indefinite, almost mysterious (especially in the light of 5:1b, "his origins..."). In 4:10 נָצַח is used, as it is in 5:1, but it signifies movement from "the city" to the "open country" (and Babylon) whereas in 5:1 it is from "you," the personified Bethlehem, to Yahweh, that is, according to his will and purposes. This suggests interpreting נָצַח in 5:1 as "birth," especially in the light of מוֹצֵא נֶפֶשׁ and יולדה. Also in 4:9 and 10 the particle כִּי is used to mark the simile. In the NT "travailing" is used metaphorically to describe the sorrow before a time of joy (cf. John 16:21; pp. 65ff.). Eliezer also interprets the metaphor this way in his commentary. This is not the usual use of the metaphor; cf. J. Kuhlmann who says, "das Bild dient dazu,

die Schrecklichkeit des Gerichts hervorzuheben" (THAT vol 1, p. 734). In the NT "travailling" is also used of a birth of a child (cf. Rev 12:4, pp. 64ff.). Finally, in 5:2 יולדה ילדה is used in connection with time, מלך מלך, and only secondarily with distress (if מלך is to be taken as "handing over" and not "entrusting").

The talmudic tradition (Yom 10a) concerning this verse brings to the forefront the connection with time. The "son of David" will not come until the "fourth kingdom" (Rome) has ruled and a period of nine months elapses. This signifies that the period of distress will not last forever. The point of the verse is precisely this; the "handing over" will come to an end, and through God's promised ruler the remnant will be restored. The oracle is one of encouragement, as also, "Comfort, comfort my people...her warfare is ended, her iniquity is pardoned...he will feed his flock like a shepherd" (Isa 40:1, 2, and 11).

Therefore, the birth imagery is not simply an "eschatological end to the crises" (Lescow), but follows the "birth" (מלך) of the Davidic ruler. If this is so, it seems nearly impossible to divorce this from Isa 7:14 (contra Rudolph). Isa 7:14, although not originally messianic, came to have messianic significance;²⁰ the mysterious tone of both these prophecies suggests that they be interpreted in the light of each other, as well as messianically (cf. Matt 1:23 and 2:6).

Mic 5:2b is not beset with the many exegetical difficulties of the previous verses; nevertheless, commentators have taken diverse views concerning the significance of these words.

The LXX and Tg have the pl. pron. "their" after "brethren." This need not imply that they had a pl. in their Vorlage, however.

They seem to have taken the "sons of Israel" as the reference of the pron. and understood the sg. of the MT as a collective; cf. e.g., Mic 3:8 where both the LXX and Tg translate the sg. collectives of the MT as pls. P, V, Aq, Sym, and Theod agree with the MT.

In the history of exegesis, Theodoret and Theophylakt follow the LXX reading the pron. as a pl. Theophylakt gives the words an ecclesiastical interpretation; "their brethren" refers to the "apostle's" brethren who will return to the "sons of Israel," that is, those of Israel who believe. Most of the remainder of commentators, both Jewish and Christian, take the sg. pron. as a reference to the "ruler;" Rosenmüller says, "non dubium esse potest."

The word יִתְּרֵם has elicited more diverse interpretations, and is usually seen in contrast to the "sons of Israel." Theodoret and Cyril say that the "remnant" refers to those of Israel who will believe in Christ. These will be united with the believers, the true "sons of Israel" (Jerome says that the "sons of Israel" refers to the Apostles). This interpretation largely prevailed in Christian exegesis down through Luther and Lapide until the time of Pusey. Departing from this tradition, Theodore interpreted the words to mean that all the tribes of Israel will be united once again. Rashi and Kara come to the same conclusion as Theodore, but Kimchi says that only Benjamin and Judah will be united. Eliezer takes an entirely different approach by saying that the cities of Judah (the "remainder") will be returned to the exilic community (the "sons of Israel"). Most modern commentators, while not agreeing as to whom the words יִתְּרֵם and בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל refer, nevertheless agree that what is spoken of here is the reunification

of all the tribes (J. M. P. Smith, Robinson, Marti, Weiser, et al.). Allen argues that "sons of Israel" refers to Judah "as heirs to the traditions of the tribal federation." One might compare Allen's statement with Nahum 2:2, "For the Lord is restoring the majesty of Jacob [= Judah] as the majesty of Israel, for plunderers have stripped them and ruined their branches."

The word לֶחֶם refers to a portion which has been divided and now has either inferior quality or number; cf. Joel 1:4, "What the cutting locust left, the swarming locust has eaten." If indeed Micah 5:2 and Isa 7:14 are to be interpreted in the light of each other, then לֶחֶם would most naturally be parallel to "shear-jashub" of Isa 7:3 (cf. Wellhausen, et al., contra Allen). The significance of "shear-jashub" in Isa 7:3 has been explained many ways (cf. Wildberger), yet Isa 7:7-9 implies that comfort or encouragement is intended, even if the name originally bore significance to another occasion (cf. Clements). Mic 5:2 indicates that it came to be understood as reference to the exilic community. In Mic 5:2 the community returns to the land as heirs of the tribal federation (cf. Allen), with perhaps a view to the idea of the reunification of all the tribes in the messianic age (cf. J. M. P. Smith; Isa 11:16, "And there will be a highway from Assyria for the remnant which is left of his people, as there was for Israel when they came up from the land of Egypt").

Kimchi argues that לֵךְ should be understood as בֵּן whereas Rosenmüller says that לֵךְ is being used in the sense of לֵךְ (cf. Wellhausen, et al.). J. M. P. Smith is correct, however, when he says that it is unnecessary to emend the text. Whether לֵךְ is better rendered as "to," referring simply to the return of the exiles to those who remained in Palestine (Rosenmüller, Mays,

et al.); or whether it is better rendered as "together with," referring to the reunification of both kingdoms in the messianic age (Rashi, Allen, Rudolph, et al.), is still in question. Either could be correct grammatically. For example, 2 Sam 15:4, "Oh that I were judge in the Land! Then every man with a suit or cause might come to me (לִי)." Or Jer 3:18, "In those days the house of Judah shall join [לְיָ ... יִלְכּוּ ; lit., 'shall walk together with'] the house of Israel." The words may have had the more restricted reference of exilic return (depending on when one dates the passage and from whose hand it stems). However, in the light of the redaction of the passage and the development of the messianic expectation in the Old Testament (e.g., Isa 11:12; Hos 2:2; Jer 3:18; etc.), the idea of the reunification of both kingdoms is to be preferred.

Micah 5:3

וְעָמַד וְרָעָה בְּעֵז יְהוָה בְּנֵאֲמָן שֵׁם יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיוּ³ MT
 וְשָׁבוּ כִּי־עֲתָה יִגְדַּל עַד־אַפְסֵי־אָרֶץ:

⁴καὶ στήσεται LXX
 καὶ θύεται καὶ ποιμανεῖ τὸ ποίμνιον αὐτοῦ ἐν ἰσχύι κυρίου, καὶ ἐν
 τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ ὀνόματος κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτῶν ὑπάξουσιν· διότι νῦν
 μεγαλυνθήσεται ἕως ἀκρῶν τῆς γῆς.

וְיָקוּם וְיִשְׁלֹט בְּחִקּוֹף מִן קִדְמֵי יְיָ בְּרִבּוֹת שְׂמָא³ P
 וְיִשְׁלֹט בְּחִקּוֹף מִן קִדְמֵי יְיָ בְּרִבּוֹת שְׂמָא
 וְיִשְׁלֹט בְּחִקּוֹף מִן קִדְמֵי יְיָ בְּרִבּוֹת שְׂמָא

וְיִשְׁלֹט בְּחִקּוֹף מִן קִדְמֵי יְיָ בְּרִבּוֹת שְׂמָא³ Tg
 וְיִשְׁלֹט בְּחִקּוֹף מִן קִדְמֵי יְיָ בְּרִבּוֹת שְׂמָא

⁴Et stabit, et pascet in fortitudine Domini,
 In sublimitate nominis Domini Dei sui;
 Et convertentur,
 Quia nunc magnificabitur usque ad ter-
 minos terrae. V

This verse brings welcome relief for the commentator from the complex and sometimes confused verses which precede it. It

follows from the introduction of the remnant motif of 5:2b, but continues more closely with 5:1 and the promise of the coming ruler. Here the ruler's reign is described in relation to Yahweh and the people.

The Tg is the only version not to translate the words literally. The translation, however, conveys the significance of the words faithfully; "And he shall rise and rule in the power from the presence of the Lord." The doublet of the LXX, "He will see and shepherd...", arose from confusing ראה and רעה. Both the variant and the correction found their way into the text (Melamed). ועמד is rendered by the usual στήσεται. The LXX also adds the implicit "his flock" after "he will shepherd," as do many modern translations (e.g., Allen, RSV, NIV). The editors of BHK₃ propose deleting ורעה for metrical reasons, but in BHS this suggested emendation is abandoned. Since the versions support ורעה, and since it fits the pastoral motif of an ideal king in the ancient Near East, there seems little reason to follow BHK₃.

The pastoral motifs depict the ideal king, a common designation throughout the ancient Near East and the Psalms. Weiser observes that this use carries into the NT and is used especially of Jesus. The early Christian commentators also noted the shepherd motif and applied this verse to Jesus. Cyril says that the Lord himself will rule and not some intermediary (as Moses ruled the Jews; cf. Haimo). Theophylakt further adds that Christ stands "in Golgotha" and shepherds "in the power of the cross" (cf. Rupert of Deutz). Nicholas de Lyra gives the words an ecclesiastical interpretation; the Church will stand against impairment, and shepherd in faithful doctrine. Luther is similar, saying that

this refers to the "kingdom"; it will not be through military force but by the Word of God and the Holy Spirit. The medieval Jewish commentators are generally more terse in their comments. Rashi simply says that the ruler will "lead" or "sustain" Israel (interpreting רעה by פרנס ; cf. Eliezer). Kimchi has a lengthy description of the grandeur of the reign of המלך המשיח this perhaps represents an anti-christological jibe, since in 5:1 he says that "he" (Christ) did not rule over Israel but that "they" (the Jews) ruled over him.

The word עמד may have a more pregnant meaning than has hitherto been recognized. Both Schwantes and Allen argue that the significance of this word is that of a new ruler assuming kingship. 2 Kgs 11:14 reads, "And when she looked, there was the king standing by the pillar, according to the custom and the captains and the trumpeters beside the king, and all the people of the land rejoicing and blowing trumpets. And Athaliah rent her clothes, and cried, 'Treason! Treason!'" (cf. also 23:3). In Dan 11:2 and 3, both מושל and עמד are used; "Behold, three more kings shall arise in Persia...Then a mighty king shall arise, who shall rule with great dominion and do according to his will" (cf. 8:23). The theme does not occur in any of the Royal Psalms, however, so caution should be exercised before drawing too heavily on this as part of a Coronation ceremony (cf. Allen). עמד may be no more than a pictorial image, as in 2 Kgs 5:11 where Naaman comes to Elisha to be cured of his leprosy, but was distraught because the prophet did not come out to him "and stand, and call on the name of the Lord his God" (cf. Keil et. al.).

Elsewhere in Micah the theme "shepherd" is used to describe the work of a ruler; "Shepherd thy people with thy staff" (7:14

of Yahweh; cf. 5:5). The shepherd motif also echoes Davidic tradition; "You shall be shepherd of my people Israel, and you shall be prince over Israel" (2 Sam 5:2, which is quoted with Mic 5:1 in Matt 2:6; cf. also 2 Sam 7:7ff.).

The connotations of ideal kingship and Davidic motifs are secondary to the role the ruler plays with respect to Yahweh; "Die Hauptsache ist, dass er mich eigenmächtig regiert, sondern 'in der Kraft Jahwes,' dessen Stellvertreter er ist ('im Namen'), wobei er sich aber stets des Abstands von seinem Gott ('in seinem hehren Namen') bewusst ist" (Rudolph). Similarly, Allen calls the ruler an "undershepherd" and Mays says, "His reign will be an expression, not a replacement of YHWH's kingship." (In this respect cf. again 2 Sam 5:2 where David is called a prince [וְהָיָה לְנָגִיד] over Israel, not a king.)

Not much need be said concerning the phrase, "In the majesty of the name of the Lord his God." Jerome calls attention to John 17:11 and 12 which other commentators also cite to equate Christ, the "God-man," with the Father (Calmet; cf. also Calvin, who says that Mic 5:3 shows Christ's subjection to God in his role as mediator). The phrase is not used elsewhere in the OT, but cf. Isa 24:14, "They lift up their voices, they sing for joy; over the majesty (בְּגָאוֹן) of the Lord they shout from the west." It is also used of the "majesty" of Jacob, "For the Lord is restoring the majesty of Jacob as the majesty of Israel, for plunderers have stripped them and ruined their branches" (Nahum 2:3 [2]; cf. Amos 8:7; and of the Philistines, Zach 9:6).

The versions preserve two vocalizations for וְיִשְׁבֹּנוּ.²¹ The Tg, P, and V point it as וְיִשְׁ(ו)בֹנוּ, as if from שָׁב. The LXX and MT point it as וְיִשְׁבֹּנוּ, from יָשַׁב. The conjunction is

omitted in the LXX and the verb is drawn into the preceding line, "They shall dwell in the glory of the name of the Lord their God." The pl. pron. does not warrant reading **אלהיהם** since the other versions are unanimous against this, and since **αὐτῶν** can be accounted for as conforming to the pl. verbs and prons. in the rest of these verses (the pl. pron. agrees especially with the verb **ὑπαρχουσιν**). Both P and V are influenced by 5:2 where they translate **יְשׁוּבוּן** as they do **יִשְׁבוּ** here. Neither connects this with the preceding, as the LXX, but they follow the MT and let **יִשְׁבוּ** stand alone with an implied predicate (cf. **רעה** above). The Tg supplies the predicate (cf. Allen, Mays, RSV; cf. also Wellhausen who supplies **בטח**) and paraphrastically renders **יִשְׁבוּ** "And they shall be gathered from the midst of their exile." In 5:2 above the Tg also renders **יְשׁוּבוּן** paraphrastically, "And they shall rely upon them, the sons of Israel."

Jerome renders the translation of Sym as et habitabunt, and says that the verb **יִשְׁבוּ** can mean both "converted" (i.e., **שוב** , as in his translation) or "dwell" (i.e., **ישב** , as in Sym). Rashi and Eliezer also take it in the same sense as **יְשׁוּבוּן** above; the comment is that they will return "from the exile." Ibn Ezra adds **בטח** in his comments which suggests that he followed the vocalization of the MT (cf. Wellhausen). Since the Reformation, this latter suggestion has all but won the day (cf. RSV, NEB, JB; however, Lapidé and Calmet follow V). Luther and Calvin prefer "dwell" over V; Luther relates this to the security of the Gospel, whereas Calvin says that these words are confirmed in 5:4. The German commentators, following Wellhausen's proposal of reading **בטח** after **יִשְׁבוּ** , have linked this with either Mic 4:1-4 (Robinson, Sellin) or with Isa 9:6 and 11:6-9 (Marti, Weiser).

In the light of the redaction of this pericope in 5:2 and 5:4f. (see below), the sense of "to dwell (securely)" in connection with the messianic expectation is most likely. Mays says, "The one explicit soteriological feature of this future reign is gathered up in the expression, 'they shall dwell.'" He further relates this to Nathan's oracle to David, "And I will appoint a place for my people Israel, and will plant them, that they may dwell in their own place, and be disturbed no more" (2 Sam 7:10).

The versions handle the final stichos diversely. Both P and V are literal translations of the Hebrew. The Tg employs the circumlocutory שְׁמִי, "his name," for the subject of "he shall increase" (יִסְגֵּי). Throughout the pericope, שֶׁ refers to the Messiah (cf. the Tg on 5:1 where מְשִׁיחֵנו becomes "whose name was proclaimed from the beginning..."). The LXX continues to employ the pl. throughout this verse; thus the "people" are magnified to the ends of the earth (Sym, however, translates ἡγία with the sg. μεγαλυνθήσεται). The pl. of the LXX continues to influence both Greek and Latin commentators (cf. Lyra). This stems from Jerome's quotation of the LXX and his comment that the church will be magnified throughout the earth because of its faith in Christ. (Although Jerome does not refer to it, his comments also seem to be influenced by Jesus' words in Matt 28:19 and 20, "Go therefore and make disciples of all nations...and lo, I am with you always, to the close of the age.")

Davidic motifs are present in these words as well; cf. 2 Sam 7:9, "And I have been with you wherever you went, and have cut off all your enemies from before you; and I will make for you a great name, like the name of the great ones of the earth." The theme of universal reign is also present in the Royal Psalms (Ps 2:8),

"Ask of me, and I will make the nations your heritage, and the ends of the earth your possession." Zech 9:10 connects both peace and unlimited dominion with the coming of the Messiah, "And he shall command peace to the nations; his dominion shall be from sea to sea, and from the River to the ends of the earth."

Micah 5:4

וְהָיָה זֶה שְׁלוֹם⁴
 אֲשֶׁר יִיבֹא בְּאַרְצֵנוּ וְכִי יֵדְרֹךְ בְּאַרְמְנֵינוּ⁵
 וְהָקִמְנוּ עָלָיו שְׁבַע רָעִים וְשָׂמְנָה נְסִיכֵי אָדָם:

MT

⁴ καὶ ἔσται αὕτη εἰρήνη· Ἀσσυρίου
 ὅταν ἐπέλθῃ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἡμῶν καὶ ὅταν ἐπιβῇ ἐπὶ τῆς χώρας ἡμῶν,
 καὶ ἐπεγεροθήσονται ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἑπτὰ ποιμένες καὶ ὁκτώ δούλους ἀν-
 θρώπων.

LXX

וְהָיָה זֶה שְׁלוֹם, (4)

P

וְהָיָה זֶה שְׁלוֹם לְאֵלֵינוּ מִיָּדָיו בְּשִׁמְנוֹתָם. וְהָיָה זֶה שְׁלוֹם
 שְׁבַע רָעִים וְשָׂמְנָה נְסִיכֵי אָדָם.

וְהָיָה מִבְּכֵן עַלְמָא לְנָא אֲחֻרָא אֲרִי יִעֲוֹל לְאַרְעָא וְאֲרִי יֵדְרֹךְ בְּבִירְעִינָא⁴
 וְיִמְנִי לְנָא שְׁבַע מְלָכִין וְחַמְנָא רַבְרְבֵי אֲנָשָׁא:

Tg

⁵ Et erit iste pax:
 Cum venerit Assyrius in terram nostram,
 Et quando calcaverit in domibus nostris,
 Et suscitabimus super eum septem pas-
 tores
 Et octo primates homines;

V

The enigmatic phrase וְהָיָה זֶה שְׁלוֹם has been variously interpreted by both the versions and the commentators. The early versions, unlike many modern commentators, tend to support the MT. V, the most literal, makes the "ruler" the subject and "peace" the predicate; "And this one shall be peace." This may be influenced by Eph 2:14, "And he shall be our peace," which may be an allusion to this text (cf. pp. 67ff.). Rudolph agrees with V's understanding of the phrase, but feels that it is grammatically incorrect. The Tg seems to interpret זֶה adverbially, "From now on (מִבְּכֵן) there will be peace for us." The Tg adds לְנָא, "for us,"

for clarification. P omits $\eta\tau$ altogether and follows the LXX by reading "when" for $\kappa\iota$. Furthermore, P employs a pl. verb for the sg. of the MT, though it might be translated, "And there shall be peace, when Assyria...." The LXX translates $\eta\tau$ by $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta$, making the "earth" in the previous stichos the subject; "And she [the earth] shall have peace, when Assyria...."

Schwantes, on the analogy of Isa 9:6 and 54:13, transposes $\eta\tau$ to the previous stichos; "And they shall dwell (securely), because now peace shall increase to the ends of the earth." This emendation is mitigated by the versions, and it would be difficult to account for the present reading if Schwantes' proposal were adopted. The most common emendation is to argue that a mem dropped out before "Assyria" through haplography; restoring the mem yields, "And this shall be peace from Assyria..." (cf. J. M. P. Smith, Mays, et al.).

Early commentators also recognized the difficulty of this construction in the Hebrew. Cyril makes an explicit textual note that the phrase belongs to the preceding words, not the following. Jerome connects it more closely with "Assyria," but also, characteristically, interprets it allegorically; this is the peace effected by Christ against the "devil" (the significance of Assyria). Theodore, alone of the early commentators, ties this to the peace which Hezekiah and Zerubbabel wrought from the historical enemies of Israel, Assyria and Persia (cf. Isho'dad and Theophylakt).

Rashi says that the peace will be definite and complete. Kara, departing from his master's words, and Eliezer connect the peace with "Assyria." Ibn Ezra and Kimchi contrast "peace" with "fear" (פחד). Kimchi, as in the Tg, adds לָנוּ , "for us," and cites Zech 9:10, "And he shall command peace to the nations; and

his dominion shall be from sea to sea" (cf. 5:3).

J. Allegro ²² has sought to illumine the text through comparative semantics. He cites the various uses of זה --demonstrative, substantive, and relative--and argues that by extension of the relative use, especially in late poetic passages and in the light of other Semitic languages (Aramaic and Arabic), זה carries the idea of a genitive relation when used in close connection with another noun. Allegro cites Judg 5:5, "God of Sinai," יהוה זה סיני (cf. also Ps 78:9). He then says, "It seems that a striking example may also be found in the Messianic prophecy of Mic 5" (p. 311), which he renders "Possessor of (Lord of) Peace" (cf. Rudolph, Heilsbringer; Allen). Allegro also cites Ps 34:7, זה עני, "the possessor of poverty."

Allen, commenting on the "strangely composite ring" of the passage, argues that this represents a "national war song," supplemented at the beginning and end with an expression of "royal victory." He further argues that Micah takes up this "jingoistic" song and ironically uses it to point the source of their confidence away from nationalistic pride towards the agent of peace and victory that God will provide.

It seems unlikely that the insertion and the changes in the oracle are Micah's, even though Micah preaches against the popular theology of the people (2:6-11; 3:11) and utilizes irony in other passages (1:10-16; 3:1-4 and 5-7; 4:14 and 5:1). We have argued above that the redaction of Micah's original prophecy (4:14 and 5:1) with its heavily messianic overtones comes from a period later than Micah's time, probably exilic. These verses seem to follow in that tradition and may represent a redaction of an oracle from the prophets of weal (perhaps even Micah's opponents) and not a

nationalistic war song. The redactor utilizes this oracle both to guard against false hopes in their own strength and to encourage the people in the time of their distress to trust in God's deliverance through his agent. The ironical note is present, especially if the original oracle was "There will be peace from Assyria... (cf. Mays, et al.). The redactor connects the oracle with the preceding by inserting the demonstrative זו ; "This one [the one who will be great to the ends of the earth--a picture of universal peace] will be our peace ["our" must be supplied, as the Tg recognized, because the peace is not abstract, as many Christian commentators argued, but is "for us" in our dire circumstances] when "Assyria" [the original oracle may have been against Assyria, but at this level of redaction it clearly is a code word (see below)] comes into our land...he will deliver (us)". Like the redaction of Micah's prophecy above, the redactor here interprets this in the light of Isaiah's prophecies (especially 9:6), who himself exhorted the people not to put trust in political-military solutions but in Yahweh (cf. e.g., Isa 2:6-11; 2 Kgs 19:20-28).

Thus, while it is possible that the demonstrative has the force of the genitive here (Allegro, Rudolph, Allen), it is more likely that it has a substantive use in order to connect these words more closely to the preceding. The awkward construction results from the composite nature of the oracle and the artificial connection between the two originally disparate oracles.

Willis, like Allen, argues for the authenticity and coherence of the passage. He makes special note of the ABA' structure of 5:4 and 5; 5:4a corresponds to 5:5b, and 5:4b-5:5a form a coherent unit. Willis states that this produces a good contrast with the distress of Sennacherib's invasion in 4:14. He also

observes the Davidic motifs throughout (the pastoral imagery especially). Willis interprets η as a demonstrative, "And this one (man) shall be peace," which serves to connect 5:3 with 5:4 and 5. This conveys the same meaning as $\eta\eta\zeta\iota\lambda$; to "bring deliverance" is the same as giving "peace."

One need not accept the chiastic structure of the verses to see the connections, although the chiasm may help to bring them into focus. The continuity stems from redaction, however, and not from Micah. The content and style follow from 5:2 and 3 if allowance is given that the core of 5:4 and 5 is taken over from an existing oracle. The exilic tradent of the Micah and Isaianic prophecies brings this independent oracle into line with the foregoing to encourage trust in God's deliverance through his chosen ruler.

The oracle continues with the threat of an Assyrian invasion. As was stated above, both the LXX and P translate κ as "when"; this also is the sense of V's cum. The Tg κ corresponds to biblical Hebrew κ . Rashi and Ibn Ezra comment that κ should be understood as $\Delta\kappa$; "If Assyria should come into our land..." (cf. Allen). κ may also introduce a temporal clause, "When Assyria, as was his wont, comes into our land..." (GKC §164d; cf. Ps 8:4, "As often as I look to your heavens"). If this is indeed a fragment of an oracle against Assyria, the former translation might be more appropriate. Whichever translation is adopted, the point of the oracle is that the attack will be adequately dealt with: in the original oracle on their own strength, but on the level of redaction, on God's provision.

Extensive comments are devoted to explaining the reference

to "Assyria." Since Jerome and Cyril, Assyria has been viewed allegorically as Satan and his attacks on the Church. Post-Reformation exegesis sought more to identify the historical situation. Calmet refers to the works of Herodotus, and ties this to the invasion of Judah by Cambyses; Lapidés cites Sennacherib's invasion, as does Allen. The German commentators Marti and Robinson tie this oracle to Syria and the Maccabaeian period (cf. also Rudolph, who states this possibility). For Keil, J. M. P. Smith, Mays, et al., Assyria represents any tyrannical enemy of Israel. Mays argues that Assyria is used as a code name for any enemy invading from the north, "the direction from which assaults on Israel had always come." Assyria is used this way for Persia in Ezra 6:22, "For the Lord had made them joyful, and had turned the heart of the king of Assyria to them, so that he aided them in the work of the house of God." It is also used of the Seleucid kingdom in Zech 10:10 f., "I will bring them home from the land of Egypt and-gather them from Assyria...the pride of Assyria shall be laid low." Mays further argues that in the eschatological theology of exilic and post-exilic times, historical names were sometimes employed to represent the present enemies who followed in their place. The parallel phrase, "land of Nimrod," lends credence to this line of interpretation. Commentators since Theodore have recognized that "land of Nimrod" stands for Babylon (citing Gen 10:8-11) which is itself a code word with heavy symbolic connotations even into NT times (cf. e.g., Rev 17f.).

While the oracle may have originally been delivered against Assyria, at the level of redaction it is divested of its historical particularity, much as 4:14 has been. It thus becomes symbolic

of any threat to Israel, with the accompanying encouragement or promise of Yahweh's eschatological rule through his ruler.

Commentators often emend ארמנותינו , "our fortified palaces," to אדמתנו , "our soil" (RSV) on the basis of the parallelism with ארץ (cf. the parallelism of ארץ and גבל in 5:5), and with the LXX, χώραν ὑμῶν , "your country" (cf. J. M. P. Smith, Schwantes, Nowack, Rudolph, Mays, et al.). The LXX, however, confuses daleth and resh on other occasions (cf. 4:14 above). Moreover, the LXX translates a rare term by a more common term elsewhere in the book; e.g., at 2:7 שלמה , "cloak," is translated by εἰρήνη , "peace" (cf. pp. 16f.). At Amos 3:9-11 and 6:8 ארמון is also translated by the LXX as χώρα . Thus the translator of the LXX on the Minor Prophets is consistent with this translation of ארמון , whether it is an erroneous or permissible (albeit uncommon) translation of ארמון .

Emendation on the basis of the LXX is therefore unwarranted. This is especially true in the light of the other versions, which all support the MT after their fashion: the Tg בִּירוֹנֵינוּא , "our palaces"; P בִּסְחָרְתֵּנוּ , "our enclosures"; and V, domibus nostris, "our houses." At Amos 6:8 V uses domos eius to translate ארמנותינו and at Amos 1:12; 2:2 and 5 aedes is employed.

There is still the argument that emendation is warranted because of the parallelism with ארץ . This argument is harder to control because of the limitations of our knowledge of Hebrew poetry and parallelism. Kugel argues that it is the nature of the parallel line that B "supports" A; that is, it "carries it further, backs it up, completes it, goes beyond it" (p. 52). It is not simply "saying the same thing twice." In this light אדמה is no more (nor less) appropriate than ארמון . In Lowth's terminology

ארמון would be classified as "antithetical" parallelism.²³ The pairing not only encompasses ארץ and ארמון (or אדמה) but also ארץ and גבל. In what sense is אדמה a more fitting word than ארמון as a parallel term to גבל? As Allen argues, ארמון is particularly fitting in the context if these verses reflect a spirit of pride and self-reliance. It is used this way in Amos 6:8, "I abhor the pride of Jacob, and hate his strongholds (וארמנותיו); I will deliver up the city and all that is in it." Thus with support of the MT from the versions, the argument to emend on the basis of parallelism is weak and seems to be unnecessary.

The LXX employs the 2nd pl. poss. pron., "in your land" and "in your country," throughout 5:4 and 5 for the 1st pl. of the MT. Moreover והקמנו is rendered by the 3rd pl. pass.

ἐπεξεργασθησονται (which suggest reading וְהִקְמִי; cf. Sellin והקמנו). The subsequent transmission of the LXX indicates an attempt to bring it into line with the 1st pl. pron. of the Hebrew text (Ziegler adopts ἡμῶν in the Göttingen LXX). The 2nd pl. pron. might result from the influence of such passages as Isa 1:7, "Your country lies desolate, your cities are burned with fire... it is desolate, as overthrown by aliens" (cf. also Isa 19:17; Jer 44:6). (It might also represent a continuation of the oracle from the Lord which began in 5:1.)

The Tg likewise represents a departure from its Vorlage, which subsequent scribes attempted to bring into conformity with the Hebrew text. Sperber adopts the reading וְיִמְנִי, "he will appoint," for the MT והקמנו, "we will appoint." Several mss. read וְנִמְנִי with the MT (z, b, g, o, f, c, and Kimchi). The Tg has also inserted לָנוּ, "for us," for the MT עָלָיו "against him." Since the expression, "we will appoint for us...", is awkward,

and since לָנָא is part of the original translation (Sperber lists no ms. evidence for reading לָהּ or עָלָהּ, which would conform to the Hebrew עָלָיו), the reading וְנִמְנִי appears to be a later attempt to bring the Tg into line with the Hebrew. The reading וְיִמְנִי conforms more closely with the treatment of this passage as a messianic prophecy by the Tg. The translator of the Tg may have felt that "we will appoint for (over) him" (i.e., the "Messiah," the only sg. antecedent in Tg's translation) of the Hebrew text was inappropriate. By reading וְיִמְנִי, the "Messiah" becomes the subject of the verb and thus provides the leadership for the people (לָנָא). Wellhausen likewise emends the text to the sg. וְהָקִים, making the ruler the subject (cf. Marti). However, the reading of the MT, though not easily explained, best accounts for all the readings and therefore would appear to be "original" (cf. p. 8).

The words "seven shepherds and eight princes of men" have been the source of widely diverse treatments by translators and commentators. The LXX translates נְסִיכִי by δῆγματα, "stings," "bites," or "attacks." This represents a confusion of samekh and shin; cf. Mic 3:5, "Thus says the Lord concerning the prophets who lead my people astray, who cry 'Peace' when they have something to eat (הַנְּשָׁכִים)." Sellin argues that if "shepherds" (רְעִים) were originally "evil ones" (רָעִים), then the LXX translation would be appropriate. He says that this line of interpretation stems from apocalyptic tradition. In a similar fashion Weiser argues that these words originally had polytheistic roots and connotations of a demonic element.

The LXX does not support these interpretations, however, since it does not recognize רְעִים as having sinister connotations,

and even **וַיַּרְבּוּ** in 5:5a is rendered as "they will shepherd" instead of "they will lay waste" (cf. Rashi). The subsequent translators of the Hebrew text into Greek recognized that the LXX was in error; Sym has **χριστούς**; Theod **ἀρχηγούς**, "princes"; and Aq **καθεστάμενους**, "appointed (leaders)." Theodoret explains **δῆγματα ἀνθρώπων** as "fighting men," **πλήγαις ἀνθρωπίναις**.

The word **נָסִיכִי** is only used in the pl. and elsewhere is only used of other nations' princes; cf. Josh 13:21, "The princes of Sihon;" Ezek 32:30, "the princes of the North." Mays says that **נָסִיכִי** "seems to emphasize their role as regents established by the 'we' of Israel," which contrasts with the divinely appointed ruler. If we are correct in seeing here a fragment of an oracle, originally spoken in false hubris against the Assyrian threat, which an editor has appended to the preceding oracle of messianic expectation, then, while there is still a certain amount of tension between the oracles, the contrast has been erased as these are now subject to the ruler of Yāhweh. The oracle is set off by "this one shall be (our) peace" and "he shall deliver (us)." What is left of the contrast brings out more sharply that God will provide a charismatic leader; "princes of men" does not emphasize the human element as much as their role as leaders.

Talmudic tradition sought to identify the leaders of this verse (Suc 52b). The "seven shepherds" are David (in the middle), Adam, Seth, and Methuselah (non-Jews; on his right), and Abraham, Jacob, and Moses (Jews; on his left). The "eight leaders" are Jesse, Saul, Samuel, Amos, Zephaniah, Zedekiah, Elijah, and the Messiah. Rupert of Deutz preserves a different tradition. The shepherds are Abel, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, and David. The leaders are Joshua, Caleph, Othniel, Aod, Barak, Gideon, Jephta the Galadite, and Samson.

Jerome, and Cyril in a similar fashion, says that "seven" refers to men of the OT (Cyril says the prophets) and "eight" refers to men of the NT (Cyril, the apostles). Haimo, Theophylakt, et al. tie "seven" to the sabbath and "eight" to the day of the Resurrection. Isho'dad says that "seven" refers to the prophets who prophesied against Assyria, and the "eight" are the princes of Hezekiah. Nicholas de Lyra and Calmet link these leaders with the Medes and Persians (cf. Lapidé). Marti and Nowack argue that this self-reliance belies the Maccabaeon period (cf. also Rudolph).

Theodore was the first to comment that "seven" and "eight" is an idiomatic expression. He says that "seven" signifies completeness and thus eight goes beyond this and points to the gravity of this divine vengeance (cf. also Pusey and, to a lesser extent, Luther). Ibn Ezra, Kimchi, and Eliezer cite Qoh 11:2, "Give a portion to seven, or even to eight," to support that it is an indefinite number of leaders. Eliezer adds that they are united, not divided (cf. his comments on $\eta\tau$, "all of them are as one group"). Calvin and Ribera say the Church will thus not lack leadership. Calvin says, "The Prophet no doubt meant a great number," and that these "governors" of the people will be endowed with the Spirit to lead as wise men. Ribera says that these leaders are the Bishops and Doctors of the Church.

The numerous examples of the sequence $x/x+1$ show that the context determines whether the numbers are definite or slightly indefinite.²⁴ This passage supports reading the sequence as indefinite since there is no hint of a particular historical situation for this part of the oracle. Significance may be found in the use of "seven" and "eight" to emphasize the sufficiency of the leadership (cf. Theodore, Calvin, et al.), but we cannot be certain about this.

וְרָעוּ אֶת-אֶרֶץ אַשּׁוּר בְּחֶרֶב וְאֶת-אֶרֶץ נִמְרוֹד בְּפִתְחֶיהָ⁵ MT
וְהָיִיל מְאֻשׁוֹר כִּי-יָבֹוא בְּאֶרְצֵנוּ וְכִי יִדְרֹךְ בְּנִבְלָנוּ:

⁵καὶ ποιμανοῦσι τὸν Ἀσσοῦ ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ καὶ τὴν γῆν τοῦ
Neβρωδ ἐν τῇ τάφρῳ αὐτῆς· καὶ ῥύσεται ἐκ τοῦ Ἀσσοῦ, ὅταν ἐπέλθῃ LXX
(6) καὶ ἐν τῇ γῇ τοῦ Ἀσσοῦ καὶ ὅταν ἐπιβῇ ἐν ταῖς οὐκίαις τῆς γῆς.

(5) מִלְחָמָה לְאִיכָּא P
וְהָיִיל מְאֻשׁוֹר כִּי-יָבֹוא בְּאֶרְצֵנוּ וְכִי יִדְרֹךְ בְּנִבְלָנוּ
וְהָיִיל מְאֻשׁוֹר כִּי-יָבֹוא בְּאֶרְצֵנוּ וְכִי יִדְרֹךְ בְּנִבְלָנוּ

5 וידנין יה ארעא דאתור Tg
בְּחֶרֶב רָת אֶרֶע נִמְרוֹד בְּתִקְוָה כִּרְכָּהּ וְשִׁחֲבִיעָא מְאֻרָּאָה וְלֹא יִיָּעִיל
בְּאֶרְעָא וְלֹא יִדְרֹךְ בְּתִחְוִמָּא:

⁵ Et pascent terram Assur in gladio,
Et terram Memrod in lanceis eius,
Et liberabit ab Assur cum venerit in
V
terram nostram,
Et cum calcaverit in finibus nostris.

Sellin argues that ורעו is from רעע , "to break," rather than from רעה , "to shepherd." This follows from his interpretation of רעים as "evil ones." Rashi before him made this suggestion, and was followed by Kara, Ibn Ezra, and Kimchi. Kimchi likens it to שבר , "to break, crush."

There is, however, a play with רעים in the previous stichos, and a connection with רעה in 5:3. Moreover, the versions support "They will shepherd"; the LXX, ποιμανοῦσιν ; the Tg, וידנין V, pascent; and P, ונארכום . There is no need to render ורעו as "they will lay waste" since בחרב defines the nature of the "shepherding," and since רעה is used metaphorically to mean "rule."

Theophylakt says that to shepherd is the "highest moral action" (cf. Calvin who says that to "feed [רעה] means to nourish

the Church). However, with לחנן the emphasis is not on moral action, as e.g., in Jer 23:4, "I will set shepherds over them who will care for them, and they shall fear no more...." Rather, the emphasis here is on the authority of their rule (cf. Ibn Ezra), and perhaps the vengeance or severity of their rule (cf. Theodore who says that Assyria will be ravaged; cf. also 4:13). In this respect, Ps 2:9 might be closer, "You shall rule (with the LXX; cf. Jerome; Rev. 2:27) them with a rod of iron." It must be admitted, however, that Israel is not usually portrayed as ruling over other nations in this harsh manner (cf. 4:1-4); other nations rule Israel this way, e.g., Jer 6:3, "Shepherds with their flocks shall come against her; they shall pitch their tents around her."

Two things emerge if these words of an originally jingoistic oracle (or war-song as Allen argues) are seen in the context of chapters 4 and 5. First, the immediate context suggests that these "shepherds" are subordinate to the shepherd who rules in the strength of Yahweh (5:3). This shepherd will bring peace (5:4a) and deliverance (5:5b) and the leaders will be intermediaries on his behalf. Second, this rule is part of the larger framework of the eschatological rule of Yahweh. The time of universal peace and trust in Yahweh (4:1-4 and 5:10-15) surrounds a time of purification and divine vengeance (4:8-5:8, especially 4:8, 13; 5:5, 8, and 9). Thus what was perhaps intended originally as personal vengeance is now set within the context of divine vengeance; it is no longer a national vendetta but divine justice which governs the vengeance. Similarly, the divinely chosen ruler's reign is subordinate to Yahweh's rule (4:7), so also the rulers raised up for vengeance are subordinate to Yahweh's vengeance (5:15).

With the exception of V, the versions shed little light on

בפתחיה. The LXX renders it ἐν τῇ τάφρῳ αὐτῆς , "at her trench." This appears to be a confusion with חפ , "trench" (cf. 2 Sam 17:9; LXX, τῶν βουνῶν). Theophylakt explains the LXX translation as "strong foundations." The Tg is similar to the MT, בנקוֹי כרכחא , "at its strong fortresses," but does little by way of explaining it. Rashi follows in the wake of the Tg by explaining בפתחיה as "the entrances (or gates) of her provinces." P, "in his anger," is, as Taylor remarks, "a despairing attempt to find something harmonizing with the verse as a whole" (cf. Sebök, "Was mir uneklärlich ist").

The translation of V, in lanceis, offers the most widely accepted alternative to the MT (cf. Luther, Calvin, Ibn Ezra, Kimchi, J. M. P. Smith, Rudolph, et al.). Aq with ἐν σειρομάσταις αὐτῆς , "with her bared-lance," and Quinta, ἐν παραξίφισιν αὐτῆς , "with her dirks," are similar. Mention is often made of Ps 55:22 (21), "His words were softer than oil, yet they were drawn swords (חֶלְבֵּדִים)." Reading "entrances" in Mic 5:5 requires only a simple transposition of the yodh. The MT may represent a more familiar word being read for a rare term once the scribal mistake was made. Elsewhere חפ is used of the opening of a text, "As he sat at the door of his tent" (Gen 18:1); or of a gate to the city, "And when he came to the gate (חפ-ל) of the city" (1 Kgs 17:10).

The Tg and P supply the implied predicate after והציל (cf. RSV, "And he shall deliver us"). Schwantes supplies the predicate on metrical grounds. Wellhausen supplies the predicate but suggests reading the pl. והצילו , as does J. M. P. Smith, Nowack, Marti, et al. The Tg also has the pl (but not P), making the leaders of 5:4 the deliverers. The versions frequently supply

the predicate where the MT does not have it; cf. 5:3 above. The Tg inserts **וְנָלַח** after "peace" in 5:4. The pl. appears to be an attempt to harmonize **וְהַצִּיל** with the pls. in the verses; the other versions militate against adopting it here. Allen, Mays, Vuilleumier, and Rudolph (though he inserts the phrase after 5:4a) read the sg. with the MT. The sg. "he will deliver" serves a vital point in the redaction of these verses, as the only logical antecedent is the promised ruler who brings "peace" (5:4). In Ps 72 **וְיַצִּל** is used of the ideal king, "For he delivers the needy when he calls, the poor with him who has no helper."

The Tg and P insert a negative particle before the final clause, "And they [P, "he"] will save us from the Assyrians. And he (i.e., the Assyrians) will not come [or perhaps, "lest he come"] into our land...." Perhaps the repetition from 5:4 of the Assyrian invasion seemed out of place in the light of the promise of deliverance in 5:5. Also there is the possibility of influence from Isa 37:30-35, "...thus says the Lord concerning the king of Assyria: He shall not come into this city...for I will defend this city to save it, for my own sake and for the sake of my servant David." This "converse translation" is a technique used by the Tg and P (cf. pp. 23 and 27f.), which was also employed at 4:14 above where the derogatory designation of Jerusalem as the "daughter of marauders" was turned into a word of acclaim (especially by P). Compare also Tg's treatment of **וְיָצַח** in 5:1, **וְיָצַח** and the translation of as "he will appoint for us" in 5:4.

Summary and Conclusions

It has not been easy to give account of the many interesting and challenging problems of Mic 4:14-5:5. Questions of authenticity, coherence, and redaction of the pericope will be uncertain so long as our knowledge remains scant and our methods lack precision. The debate still centres around the literary-critical methods and results of Stade and others from nearly a century ago. Our purpose was not, however, to enter into this debate. We do suggest that there are reasons for viewing 4:14 and 5:1 as authentic Mican material. The shift at 5:2 (and 5:3) may indicate a different hand at work in the text. It has, however, been carefully woven into the existing oracle and brings into line both Mican and Isaianic themes. Finally, 5:4 and 5 were also appended to the preceding. In the appending, it was transformed from an existing oracle of weal against the (Assyrian) advance into an oracle affirming the sufficiency of the Lord's provision of leadership. The redaction has obscured the historical particularities so that it becomes a warning against any enemy invasion.

We can address the questions of text, philology, and syntax with more certainty, though debatable points will always remain. With the exception of emending or restoring a heh before צעיר the MT of 4:14-5:5 is best left without alterations. The proposed emendations may in fact obscure important exegetical points. For example, if we emend the text to read "From Assyria" (מֵאַשּׁוּר) in 5:4a, we miss the point that it is the promised ruler of the previous verses who effects the peace. (זֶה is probably used substantively.) Similarly, if we read the pl. for MT וְהָצִיל in 5:5b, we miss the point that the "shepherds" and "leaders of men" are subordinate to the ruler, just as he is subordinate to the Lord.

Emendations for syntactical reasons were also seen to be unnecessary and to obscure stylistic differences. For example, reading the pl. for שם in 4:14 is unnecessary since an indefinite sg. can be rendered as a passive. It is also a stylistic contrast to the pl. in the following stichos. Similarly, reading מהיוט in 5:1 for להיוט is unnecessary since the prefixed prepositions overlap in use or can be interchangeable in biblical Hebrew (cf. also על in 5:2 where לא might be better).

We have argued that תגדל בל תגדלי is best rendered as, "Now gash yourself, O Daughter of Marauder." This should be understood as a remark of derision against those in Zion who have abandoned true worship of the Lord. The LXX resulted from a misreading and can be safely ignored for purposes of emendation. The Tg is a mistranslation which stemmed from the failure to view תגדל בל as a derogatory reference to Zion following from the promises of 4:13. Moreover, תגדל was taken to mean "troop," which has positive connotations, and not "marauder," which does not.

We have further argued that מוצאיו in 5:1 must be interpreted in the light of נצ' in the previous stichos and in 5:2. The three terms reinforce each other and support the birth imagery in these verses. Many Christian commentators have found significance in the pl. "his origins"; however, it is doubtful that any exegetical significance should be attached to this any more than significance should be attached to the sg., שם and the pl., יכו in 4:14 (cf. Eliezer's comments). Moreover, since the term is rare, any detailed significance attached to it would be highly speculative. It is better to restrict our comments only to what the context, in its general way, will support.

In a similar fashion, significance is often given to עולם as denoting the eternal egress of the ruler. The context militates against this; עולם, "Bethlehem Ephrathah" and "among the clans (באלפי) of Judah" point to his ancient clan lineage, not his eternal nature (cf. also Mic 7:20, מימי קדם).

As a result of our examination of Mic 4:14-5:5, we offer the following translation.

MICAH 4:14-5:5

- 4:14 Then gash yourself (as the heathens), O Daughter of Marauder;
A siege is laid against us;
The "king" of Israel (is humiliated),
They strike (him) with a rod upon the cheek.
- 5:1 But you, O Bethlehem Ephrathah,
Who are too small (to be numbered) among the clans of Judah;
From you, according to my purposes,
One will be born to be ruler over Israel;
His roots are from of old, from the days of antiquity.
- 5:2 Therefore (in the meantime), God will hand over Israel
(to their enemies),
Until the time when she who travails gives birth;
Then the remainder of his brethren will return with the sons of Israel.
- 5:3 He will assume leadership and rule steadfastly,
In all the strength and majesty of the Lord, his God;
And they shall dwell (securely),
Because at that time, his renown will spread throughout the earth.
- 5:4 And this (ruler) will bring peace (for us);
When "Assyria" comes against our land,
And treads upon our strongholds;
Then, from among us, will be raised leaders--
"Seven shepherds and eight princes of men."
- 5:5 And they will rule the land of "Assyria" with strength,
And the land of "Nimrod" with power;
But (the ruler himself) will deliver (us) from "Assyria";
When he comes against our land,
And treads upon our borders.

CHAPTER FOUR

ELIEZER OF BEAUGENCY

I. INTRODUCTION

Eliezer is all but unknown among the great Jewish commentators of the Middle Ages. Since he comes at the end of a distinguished line of French commentators--Rashi, Joseph Kara, and Rashbam--his works are easily overlooked or become overshadowed by the earlier masters. Eliezer is mentioned only incidentally by the generation of commentators who followed him. In the manuscript we now possess,¹ his name appears at the end of his commentary on Isaiah and Ezekiel. He flourished during the twelfth century in Beaugency (Balgentiacum), a town in the Loiret district of Northern France.²

Eliezer was indeed a "child of his age" (Poznanski) and thus drew upon previous interpreters without necessarily specifying those he utilized. He does refer to Rashi as "our Rabbi" or "great Rabbi" (though not in the commentary on Micah). Rashbam is mentioned in the commentary on Isaiah (רבינו שמואל). It also appears that he used Joseph Kara and Ibn Ezra (Poznanski, pp. cxxxi-cxxxviii). For grammatical explanations, Eliezer, as also many of the medieval Jewish commentators, relied upon Menachem ben Saruq and Dunash ibn Labrat. For historical references in the prophetic literature, there was "Sefer Yosippon," the popular history of the Jews attributed to Josephus (this was, however, an anonymous work perhaps composed in medieval Byzantine Italy).³

Poznanski and Nutt argue that Eliezer was a pupil of Rashbam. This is difficult to substantiate from the other literature of this period since personal references are so sparse in the commentaries. The internal evidence, however, is suggestive. This is especially evident in the strong adherence to peshat, and very little use of talmudic material. Also, both commentators make frequent reference to the context and development of thought rather than notes on individual words or phrases.⁴ These features in particular set Eliezer and Rashbam apart from the earlier French commentators (cf. also Poznanski, pp. cxxix and cxxxv).

The extant manuscript of Eliezer's commentaries on Isaiah, Ezekiel, and the Minor Prophets is located at the Bodleian Library in Oxford. From other references it appears that Eliezer wrote commentaries on other books, if not on the entire Hebrew scriptures.

III. THE COMMENTARY ON MICAH

Poznanski, Nutt, and others have pointed out certain characteristics of Eliezer's commentaries. We will discuss these as they relate to the commentary on Micah.

Poznanski says that Eliezer's style does not have the brevity of Rashi, the beauty of Kara, nor the simplicity of Rashbam. Nevertheless, it does have a quality of being straightforward and to the point (Poznanski, pp. cxxxix-cxlii). For example, in Mic 1:1 Eliezer simply observes that Micah was from Mareshah, as the Targum indicates. Similarly, in 7:2 for the phrase, "The godly man has perished from the land," he says that there is no one to turn God's wrath from destruction, and only sinners and evil men are left among the people. That "They all lie in wait for blood"

is simply explained as "human blood." Finally, "With a net" is tantamount to saying, "With a snare." All this is very straightforward with no mincing of words, and no homiletic elaborations or talmudic appropriation.

On occasion Eliezer, however, can be obtuse, or at least inelegant. For example, at 1:6 for the phrase, "A heap in the open country," Eliezer comments, "For a cleaning of sweepings of a field." At 1:11 he answers his question about why the verse says so much about mourning by **שעל מספד ש.מספדו ביום במקום** **האצלי הסמוך לאויב אצלו**. At best there appears to be a certain superfluity in this answer (see the translation of 1:11 and footnote 18 for a discussion of all the problems surrounding the translation of this comment; **ביום** and **האצלי** are superscriptions in the ms. and are either best omitted or left untranslated). Again, at 7:1 the phrase, "As when the summer fruit has been gathered," Eliezer explains by saying **הן הסייפוט הגרועים שבפירות שלא נשאר בפרדס רק אוסף הקיץ שכל החשובים נלקטו**. This I have translated, "These are the late ripening fruits which are defective among the produce, because there is nothing left except the gathering of the summer fruit." These illustrate that although Eliezer is generally straightforward, he can become muddled with his words (cf. also 2:6-11; 5:6; and 6:5). It is where the MT of Micah is most troublesome that Eliezer himself becomes obscure or difficult.

Traditional interpretations figure prominently in the writings of the medieval Jewish commentators, especially since some of them, like Rashi, wrote commentaries on the Talmud as well. Eliezer seldom draws upon these traditions, preferring simple peshat to the sometimes fanciful derash. Eliezer makes no explicit

reference to his medieval predecessors, though he does follow their interpretations on occasion in his commentary on Micah (e.g., 1:3, passim). He does make reference to the Targum in 1:1. In 6:1-4 he utilizes targumic tradition; cf. especially the comments about Moses, Aaron, and Miriam. At 4:10 Eliezer quotes the rabbinic exegetical principle קל וחומר "from minor to major," in order to make the point that these words held even more importance for the exilic community than the pre-exilic community to which they were addressed.

The meaning of Hebrew words or phrases is sometimes indicated by its French equivalent by commentators of this period. These are often a valuable source for adding to the lexical information of the French language, as well as indicating the commentator's understanding of the Hebrew. Eliezer gives a French equivalent on ten separate occasions: at 1:8 éstordiz for ואלילה אלכה שולל ; 1:11 son étal for עדמתו ; 1:12 a deamender for לטוב ; 1:13 atteléz for רתום ; 1:14 faillance for אכזב ; 2:10 déraciner for והחבל ; 3:3 rongerent for פצחו ; 4:1 adrèzé for נכון ; 6:8 simplicité for הצנע ; and 6:14 abattement for וישחק . (For a complete discussion of the word in question see the appropriate verses and footnotes.)

Another characteristic of Eliezer's commentaries is his endeavor to date the prophecies or root them in historical circumstances. Sennacherib and Assyria figure most prominently in these references in the commentary on Micah. The adverse times depicted in 4:10 and 11 are equated with Sennacherib's invasion of Judah. Likewise the siege described in 4:14 is linked to Sennacherib, where Eliezer quotes 2 Chr 32:21 to explain that the "blow upon the cheek" refers to Sennacherib's shameful return to his land

(לך in 4:14 is said to be "from God," a pl. of majesty). The "peace" of 5:4 is peace from the Assyrian oppression. Since Eliezer links 7:8 and 9 with 4:11, these verses also refer to Sennacherib's oppression and his judgment by God.

Israelite kings are mentioned in three verses. The mention of Lachish as the "beginning of sin" in 1:13 is equated with Solomon and his acquisition of chariots and "foreign wives." At 4:9 the phrase, "Why do you cry aloud?" is related to when Judah sought help from Egypt and Assyria "as in the days of Ahaz." Quoting 2 Kgs 18:8 and 2 Chr 32:23, Eliezer ascribes the phrase in 7:10, "Now she will be trodden down like the mire of the streets," to the days of Hezekiah.

The exile is mentioned four times by Eliezer. Mention has already been made above to 4:10 where the exile has to be inferred from Micah's words. At 1:11 the mention of "its support" being taken away is taken to mean the cities lost during both Israel's and Judah's exile. The comment at 2:10 for "arise and go" is "into exile." Finally at 7:18 the "remnant of his inheritance" refers to those who remain "from the exile of Sennacherib."

On one occasion Eliezer looks to the past and connects 2:12 and 2:13 with the exodus and conquest. Finally, at 4:9 and 5:1 he sees a future fulfilment ("in the latter days") when the kingdom of God and the kingdom of David shall be established in Zion.

Grammatical notes are sparse in Eliezer's commentaries. At 2:4 Eliezer observes that the nun in ללללל does not effect a change in meaning between the niph'al and the qal form also used there. He quotes other examples where the qal and the niph'al forms share the same meaning (however, ללללל is actually a

pi'el form). Eliezer comments that **לי** in 2:4 is the same as saying **עלי**. Similarly, at 2:7 **בית יעקב** is tantamount to saying **בית יעקב**. He observes that scripture does not always make these distinctions. At 2:10 Eliezer says that **אחבל** is the "uprooting" of the **חבל** (Eliezer understands this as "rope; cord;" but cf. RSV, "destruction), even as **אשרש** is the uprooting of the **שורש**. Finally, the 'aleph in **אספה** (4:6) serves as both the prefix and the root letter. These grammatical comments, though few in number, indicate Eliezer's awareness and knowledge of forms and usage. He does not, however, make explicit reference to Menachem ben Saruq or Dunash ibn Labrat in the commentary on Micah.

Variant readings in the medieval commentaries are difficult to assess.⁵ Since texts were not divided into chapter and verse, many so-called variants are simply a lapse of memory. Each variant, however, must be examined on its own merit. Furthermore, since we are working from an edited text, variants must be examined against the ms.

At 2:1 the ms. reads **און בפעלי במחשבותם**. Poznanski "corrects" this to read **און בפעלי רע במחשבותם** as in the MT (he does say that **און** is in the ms.). Poznanski assumes that the words are lemma and that a scribe has mistakenly written **און**. The ms. indicates rather that the words are not lemma but a paraphrase or shortening of the whole line which the following comments further elucidate.

At 3:8 the MT reads **אולפ אנכי** but the ms. reads **אבל אנכי**. Again, this does not appear to be lemma, but only a paraphrase. Since **אולפ** seems to have dropped out of use in mishnaic Hebrew (Segal, §294), the use of **אבל** in its place would convey the appropriate meaning.

The existence of a variant reading or vocalization at Mic 6:7 seems more assured. Rather than reading אֵילִים as "rams" (cf. RSV), Eliezer renders it as "oaks" (from which "rivers of oil" flow). Neither the versions nor the other medieval Jewish commentators express knowledge of this reading, and Eliezer himself gives no other clue except his comment that "rivers of oil" flow from the "myriads of oaks."

Eliezer also quotes texts outside of Micah which differ from the MT. Eliezer quotes Jer 15:18 at Mic 1:14. Rather than the rare form הִיָּה נִהְיָה he employs the more familiar הִיָּה נִהְיָה (הִיָּה is only used four times in the OT; cf. BDB, p. 224). At Mic 2:4 Eliezer cites Jer 50:6. There is no introductory formula such as כִּמְנוּ (though Poznanski inserts this in brackets), and the citation appears to be a paraphrase since the word order is altered and the qere is read in place of the kethib. The MT is מָהֵר הָרִים שׁוֹבְבִים מָהֵר אֶל-גִּבְעָה הַלְכוּ but Eliezer simply says מָהֵר אֶל גִּבְעָה שׁוֹבְבִים. Finally, Eliezer quotes 1 Kgs 5:11 (4:31) at Mic 6:9. Poznanski inserts הַגּוֹיִם, as in the MT, but observes that the ms. reads וַיְהִי שְׁמוֹ בְּכָל הָאָרֶץ. This would seem to be a lapsus memoriae since there is no particular point to be made from this reading as opposed to the MT.

On occasion Eliezer quotes the Vulgate or christological interpretations, which he then refutes. In his commentary on Micah, however, he neither quotes the Vulgate nor refutes christological interpretations. Mic 4:14-5:5, the one passage where we might expect some comment, Eliezer interprets with respect to Sennacherib's invasion (4:14; 5:4 and 5) and the future ("end times," cf. 5:1) Messiah (5:1-3). Rashi likewise does not call

attention to the Christian interpretation of the passage. Evidently the positive value of saying what the passage means, rather than what it does not mean, was the best refutation of the christological interpretation.

Eliezer is noted for his attempts to give rational explanations of miracles, and his strict adherence to peshat. He nevertheless is influenced by astrology and the influence of the stars on man's fate. In the commentary on Micah, Eliezer mentions מזל, "luck, fate," on two occasions. At 1:12 the מזל of the kings of Judah begins to increase to the effect that the consequences of the Philistine rebellions are amended. Similarly, at 2:3 the מזל of those "who devise evil on their beds" (2:1) becomes weak "for it will be an evil time" for them.

Eliezer demonstrates his grasp of the Hebrew language by recognizing both paranomasia and biblical idiom. He makes special mention of word-play on five occasions: at 1:10 between גו and גד ; at 1:11 between צאנן and יצאה ; at 1:14 between אכזיב and אכזב; at 1:15 between יורש and מורשה; and at 4:14 between גדוד and מהגדדי .

On numerous occasions Eliezer makes reference to idiomatic expressions in the text. For example, for the word שמעו in 1:2 Eliezer says, "Every time a text speaks of hearing, paying attention, or listening to peoples, or heaven and earth, it is concerned with judgment." Similarly, at 2:4 שביבה is the "terminology of exile." At 4:13 החרמתי is said to be the "term of consecration," what we might call a "cultic expression." To illustrate or substantiate these observations Eliezer quotes other biblical passages where the terms occur.

Eliezer quotes biblical passages to explain terms which are

not easy to explain, or to draw attention to analogous references, or simply for clarification. For example, at 1:11 he quotes Job 26:13 and Gen 49:21 to explain that the term **שפיר** has the sense of "unveiled." At 6:14 Eliezer draws attention to the fact that those of the wicked generation shall not escape judgment, just as Hazael and Jehu did not let those who rebelled against their rule escape punishment (1 Kgs 19:17). Or finally, at 2:9 Eliezer quotes Ezek 16:14 to clarify that "my glory" refers to "embroidered garments" (though he further notes that there is no glory without "honor and grace").

Finally, one of the most notable characteristics of Eliezer's commentaries is his concern to link words, phrases, and even verses or pericopes to their context rather than treating them in isolation, as was the general practice during this period. Within a verse Eliezer may show how one word relates to another as in 1:4 where "wax" is linked with "melting" in the previous stichos. Eliezer also shows the development of an argument or a line of thought between verses, as in 1:14 where "therefore" gives occasion for Eliezer to recapitulate what was said in 1:13. This can also be developed within an entire pericope, as in 2:6-11 where Eliezer refers both backwards and forwards from the word or phrase he is commenting upon to other words or phrases in the passage. Finally, a verse from a later section of the book may be related to an earlier passage, as in 3:5 which Eliezer likens to 2:6-11, or in 4:8 which recalls 2:12. This further demonstrates the coherence of the entire book.

In conclusion, we may observe that although Eliezer stands at the end of a distinguished line of commentators, he was not a mere compiler or synthesizer, or one who simply reiterates the

the views of those who preceded him. Rather, Eliezer shows a surprising degree of independence and innovation. To be sure, he is a child of his age and agrees with his predecessors on numerous interpretations, but he is not a slave to his tradition nor his mentors. Eliezer is a learned pupil who preserves and enlarges upon the great learning of the medieval Jewish commentators.

II. THE TEXT AND MANUSCRIPT

The text edited by Poznanski has numerous deviations from the ms. Some of these may be explained as printing errors; however, there are a number of oversights or omissions by the editor himself.

The most common deviations are misprints or oversights--the omission or addition of a letter, one letter written in place of another, an incorrect reference, and so forth. Differences of a single letter occur at 1:13, הוא is printed for היא (cf. MT); at 1:14 אכזב is printed for אכזיב (cf. MT); at 2:12 וקבצתים is printed for וקבצתם ; at 3:3 לבבם is printed for לבם ; at 3:6 ואפילה is printed for ואפלה (it is usually scriptio defectiva); at 4:9 ויהי is printed for ויהיו ; at 6:9 צדקה is printed for צדק ; at 6:10 האש is printed for היש.

Occasionally these misprints or oversights slightly alter the intention. At 1:15 שבאורו is printed for שבאורה ; the fem. suf. refers to "land." At 4:1 שבטחו is printed for שיבטחו the imperfect suits the context better. At 4:14 הוא is written for היא ; the fem. pron. refers to "Assyria." At 5:1 יהיה is printed for יהיו ; and at 5:2 איוביהם is printed for איוביהם either form could be employed though the ms. is to be preferred. At 6:15 יאכלהו is printed for יאכלוהו ; the pl. "enemies" is

the subj. And finally at 7:2 נשאר is printed for נשארו ; the pl. is more appropriate in the context.

On five occasions references are incorrectly given. At 1:16 read Ps 103:5 for Ps 133:5; at 2:4 read 2 Sam 6:22 for 2 Sam 10:22; at 4:6 read Gen 46:31 for Gen 36:41; at 4:8 read 2 Kgs 5:24 for 1 Kgs 5:24; and at 7:3 read Ex 28:22 for Ex 28:14.

Of a more substantial nature are those occasions where words have been inserted that are absent from the ms., or the ms. has been corrected but not properly noted, or the division between phrases differs from that of the ms., or where even the ms. has been mistakenly cited in the notes.

On three occasions Poznanski corrects a mistake in the ms. but fails to note it. At 4:14 the ms. omits על before לחי (cf. MT יכו על לחי). At 6:14 Poznanski omits an obvious ditto-graphy of a whole line but fails to note it (see footnote 78). Finally, at 3:3 Poznanski corrects the transliteration of rongerent, but then cites the ms. incorrectly (see footnote 47).

On several occasions Poznanski divides the text at a different point than the ms. but the division of the ms. yields a smoother sense. At 1:11 the ms. has a pause after "pasture" whereas the edited text runs the two sentences together (cf. footnote 17). At 1:12 the ms. has a pause after "the kings of Judah" whereas Poznanski omits this (cf. footnote 21). At 1:15 the ms. has a stop after "on that side" and הכל belongs to the following sentence (cf. footnote 30). At 2:12 there is no stop after "in the midst" and הדבר is not in the ms. (cf. footnote 42). At 3:2 the ms. does not have a pause until the middle of the line after "Jacob," but Poznanski pauses after מוסב (cf.

footnote 45). At 5:1 the question ends with "Bethlehem" not יצא (but cf. footnote 68). And finally at 5:3 the printed text does not have a stop after "David;" rather appears to be a lemma (cf. footnote 72).

The ms. is cited incorrectly at 7:8. עליו of the ms. is more appropriate than Poznanski's emendation to ואלו (he cites the ms. as reading עלו; cf. footnote 97). And at 7:12 Poznanski cites the ms. as reading פרם , whereas it clearly reads פרט (cf. footnote 99). At 1:11 Poznanski incorrectly wrote "Israel" for "Judah" after בגלות. At 4:14 he omits היה after ש . And finally, at 5:1 Poznanski adds "Judah" after Bethlehem.

In the translation I have sought to be as literal as possible. On occasion, such as at 1:11, this has been all but impossible, and I allowed myself more freedom in order to make a smoother sentence in English. This is usually mentioned in a footnote so the reader may make his own decision. Lemma is underscored to set it plainly apart from the comments, and citations of the text which are not lemma but form part of the comments are indicated by inverted commas. The distinction is not always easy to maintain. The lemma and biblical quotations are usually rendered by the RSV translation except where this translation is clearly not the translation Eliezer had in mind.

לשמאל]. בין טוב לרע ולא לחבשים ולא לחור. הם חושבים ושואני חושבים כלום. כגון תנוקות ובהמה רבה. ובשבלם אשא לכל המקום אף אם לא עשו תשובה כדברך. אבל על ידי תשובה חסתי עליהם. וכאן הניד לו תשובתם:

ורוחו נתקדרה. אשר בו נתפוררה.
ומיכת המורשת. לדעתו החרשת:

מ'כ'ה.

א.

- 1.2 המורשת. מן מרשה כתרנימו: כל מקום שנאמר שמיעה והקשבה או האונה לעצים או לשמים וארץ הוא עסק ששפט. ועדותו בבם לעד. להעיד 3 ולהתעורר בבם אם לא תשובו: ודרך על כסתי ארץ. ויכניע וישפיל כל 4 תנאונים ודמים: כיוונג. כל מיני רבב קורא דונג. ומוסב על גופו: 6 וסמי בסות יתורה. שידריך וישפיל: לעי תורה. לנרשח כיכור שדה: שאין 7 בה ישוב: ותנתי לניא אבניה. כמים מגרים: וכל אתנניה. המורה כספ וזהב ורקסח ואבנים טובות שעשה להפסילה: כי מאתן ונתן קצצה שמרון אותם. אתנן לאילית שנתה עסק: ועד אתנן ונתן. כלומר וספן 8 ליאבר ולישרף כאתנן ונתן: אבל על זאת אספדה ואיליה אכזה שולל 9 ופאנדרין: בתמיהו לכב. כי אנושה סכת שמרון כל כך שננע עד שער 10 עמי. עד ירושלים. ועל זה יש לכבנה שיהורה וירושלים לקין עמה: בנת אל תנידו. סכת ירושלים. פן תשחחנה בנות פלשתים: ויבאו עלינו: גת. 11 גר. לשון נופל: כבית לעפרה. [120a] לפני מעפרה. במסחרים חככו ולא בחיץ. עפרה. עפר. לשון נופל: עברי לכם. הסתלקו מסקומכם. ישבת שפיר. נילוי. כמו ברוחו שמים שפרה (איוב כ"ז י"ג). אמרי שפר (בראשית מ"ט כ"א) אמרים מנולים, וכן אמר הסתלקו מלככות ומלסמור כמקום הסגולה ונראה ונשמע לגוים: על עריה בשות. על גלוי בשתכם שלא ינלה לאויבים. עריה. כמו עריה תעור קשתך (חבקוק ג' ט') שפתורנו נלה תנלה קשתך: גם ישבת צאנן. מקום צאן הרגילים לצאת לסרעה

(י) עיי רש"י ור"י קרא.
(ז) כמו תראה מורש עיי הוא למי דעת הסתבר מקום שנתפס לשם מה שמכירים מן השדה.
(ח) עיי רש"י. (i) (dward) ועיי רש"י ופרושו של מחברנו לישעיה נ"ט ס"ו.
(ט) עיי שמואל ב' א' כ"י. ועיי רש"י.

תחורר שלא תצאו בכבי ובמספר. יצאה צאנן. לשון נופל: וזל כך לסה. שעל מספר שתפסו ביתי במקום האצלי הסמוך לאויב אצלי: תנניש ונבוא ויקח מסב עמדתו. הערים: שלקחו מלכי ישראל ויהודה מסגו שותיה עומר כהם. כגון עיי סואב ונלעד שחורו להם בגלות ישראל. וכן עיי פלשרים בגלות ישראל. עקדתו. שון אשפיל: כי חלה לסוב. סתחלת להיתקן 12 ישבת מרות. כמו על הארץ מרתים עלה עליה דיומיהו (נ' כ"א). הן פלשתים היושבים אצלם ומוכנים תמיד לסרות ולסורד כמלכי יהודה החזיל מולם להתנבר והתחילה להיתקן מעיוות שעותיה לח. מלכי יהודה: פי ירד רע מאת יי. שהיה מסיב להם. וכאשר רע לירושלים טוב לפלשת. וישבת מרות ומרד שלהם: לשוב. אפאנדרין: להם. אשפיל: קיסור 13 ויווג לסוס והשור לקרין קורא רחיסה. וכן אמר קשור המרכבה לרכב, הרין מרד ישבת לכיש לכרוח ולגוס מפני מלך אשר: רכש. כמו רכבי הרכש (אסתר ח' יד). בריה קלה היא מאד: רכש ולכיש לשון נופל: יאשרית חטאת הוא. המרכבה, לבת ציון. כי כך. ציון. נמצאו פשעי ישראל תחלה, ששלמה הרכה לו מרכבה וסוסים וגשים נבריות ועל ידיהם חטא בע"ז ונחלקה מלכותו וחטאו בעגלי ירבעם. נמצאו בציון תחלה פשעי ישראל: לכן, על אשר כך נמצאו פשעי ישראל תחלה על ידי נשים נבריות. 14 חתני, עירך. שלוחים לאומות, שיחויקו בעריך על שלוחי בנותיה שנשא שלמה, כשתגלי סאריץ. לבר על מורשת גת, שחתור לה איין ירושתה שלקחו ממנה מלכי יהודה: שלוחים, סתנות נשואין שנותן [אדם] לבתו בשמשלחה סביתו לבעל [כספו] ויתנה שלוחים לבתו אשת שלמה: (מ"א ט' ס"ז). ואחר שלוחיה (שמות י"ח ב') ביוצא בו: גם בתי אכוב. מקום הוא. הנבחים והנשאים. לאכוב ולשוא יהיו מלכי ישראל ולא ינצלו בם. אכוב ואכוב לשון נופל. אכוב פלגנא: כמו היה חזיה לי כמו אכוב (ירמיה ט"ז יח). וכן כל לשון כוב. אשר לא יושבת מרשה: עד עולם. יבא הורש. שורט תחלה את הארץ. אביא לך יושבת מרשה: עד עולם. יבא מרשה לורש כבוד ישראל וחזקו שבאותו הארץ: כבוד ישראל. מסב על הכל יירש יורש ראשון כהתחלה: יבא. מסב על אביא, ועל הורש אמר

(י) עיי פירושו של מחברנו לישעיה ח' י'
(ז) הלשון מנומס קנת. ונתה מפרש גם זה מחברנו בית האצל לא בחור שם עצם כיא מלשון זה אצל זה כמו רש"י והפירוש המיוחס לר"י קרא (מדרש עפנשטין בהמאסף ברבא אברהם שייך לכבוד ה"א בלתי), אולם כאומן אחר.
(ח) בכבי הדיים. (i) (dard) ועיי רש"י ופרושו של מחברנו לישעיה נ"ט ס"ו.
(ט) נתה מרש חלה מלשון חולה וברות מלשון איי שמכנה גובע למי דעתו גם מרתים בירמיה.
(י) (i) (dard) ועיי רש"י ופרושו של מחברנו לישעיה נ"ט ס"ו.

16 אביא: יורש ומורשה לשון נופל: קדתי, ביר, נוג, ככלי דרך אבל: כנשי-
שנמרם ונקרה כל נוצחו ועוד, סגול אחרת, והוא שאמר, תחדש בנשתי
נעוריי (תחלים קליג ה'): כי גל מסך, וירש ראשון וירש:

ב.

- 1 ופעל רע', כחשבותם, וכאשר יקמו לאור הבקר משכיתם.
ועושים כחשבתם הרעה, כי יש לאל ידם, ובכל הזכות עושים ואין.
3 נסמעים: חנני חושב, כנגד כחשבותיכם'; ולא הלכו רומה, קוסמיות'.
4 כי יעלו פשעיהם על צואריכם ויכשילו כותכם: כי עת רעה היא, לכם.
4 וסול שלכם הולך ודל: יאש עליכם משל, הסופר: שרור נשורונו, שורנו.
כמו ונקלותי עוד (ש"ב י"ב), שהוא כמו קלותי, והנני כמו נסמכות ונסמ-
(ש"א מ"ז ט'). ונהפוך הוא (אסתר ט"א), אהה, כי ודאי שרור שרדנונו.
האויבים': הלק שהיה לו לעמי יחלוק בארצו: וסיר, שנבירים וקיום
חולקים אותה במקומו, איך ימשי עוד ויסיר האויב [1200] משם: לי, עלי.
שרה לשוב ולהפיר אותנו מן הארץ יחלק שריו לאויבנו, כאילו לעולם.
אין לנו לשוב עוד בארץ: כל שכניה הוא לשון גלות ופירוד (במן) מהו.
6 אל נבעה שיבבום', נפשי ישוב (תהלים כ"ג ג'), אם יפיר ונתקעה
6 מפרעה הטוב יתני כמעלי צדק עוד אל המרעה: לכן, על אשר עתה
עשך נבר וכתו איש ונחלתו, לא יהיה לך יורש משלך חבל בגול בארץ.
8 חוריים יחלקו: אל תסופו יסופון, נביאי השקר לנביאי, והאי היה ראוי
שלא יסופו נביאי לאלה שאין אלא מתלוצצים על דבריהם, ולא יסו-
7 הגביא [בלסות]: האמר כח יעקב, וכי ראוי שיהא אמור דבר זה בכת-
יעקב שהושבתי להם מעולם שאמר לנביאי שלא ינבאו ולא יסופו להם.
הקצר רוח יי, שאת הכרתי להם על ידי נביאי כרוזי שנחתי עליהם דבר.
ולא בא ולא נתקיים: או שאת אלה מעללי ומעשיו להם, שבריו ואבריו
לנביאי שלא ינבאו להם מאחי, וכי כך הם מעללי עמם: הלא דברי שאני.
מרבר על ידי נביאי, ויטובו לעולם עם אותו שישר הולך ופועל צדק, ולמה
יהא אמור כבית יעקב דבר זה, בית יעקב כמו בבית יעקב, וכדנה רבות
8 במקרא: ואחמול, וכנגד נביאי', יקום נביא השקר את עמי לאויב,
שמתעים את עמי כשקריהם וכתנפיהם לשוא את נביאי כלפי שדבריו

(י) כבי און, (י) עי' בספרו הסיוח לרי קיא הנ"ל.

(י) הוא מירוש התינוק: ולא תהיון בקוסה וקוסה, והלכו בעקבותי כל המפרישים.

(י) ר"ל שמה נשורנו הוא כחשבת נפלי אבל יש לה מוכן של קל.

(י) הסתבר רצה להביא מה ירמיה נ' אכל כססו על כח זכרנו מעה כי בכחכ

אחיה: היום שוכנעו סור אל נבעה הלכו, ומירשו קרוב דברי ה"י בן ננחא כמי השריש
שי שבת שפורש גם הוא היום שוכנעו כמו גרשום ולשונם כמו ולגיש,

(י) הגז פיר אמרול כמו מלה מורכבת מן את ומול, והוא מירוש התינוק: מקביל ד

מרביתם להם כשמי, ישיבו להם, להשיב ולא להרע, הם, בשמתי אני
שלום וכי אדבר המה למלחמה (תחלים ק"ז ו'): וא"ת שנביאיהם וראשיתם
וקציתם משיבים לעמי, לא כי מטיל שלמה, מסקים שאין לי לעני לכמות
כשרו אלא השלמה בלבד שמכסה בלילה ומכסה עליה אדרתו, מפני הכושה,
שלא יראה עליה שמלתו על עורו, משם מפשיטין: מעליו אדרתו מאותו
שעוריהם על הדרך כשח: שוכי, נוחי מלחמה שהיו סוברים להיות עמם
בשלום ולא היו נשמרים מהם: נשי עמי, העניים', אתם מנרשים מביט 9
הענוניה, שאין לכם בו כלום'; קעל עולליה תקחי הדדי, ששמתי עליהם,
ולא משלכם, לעולם, בלי השכון: הדדי, הם בדר לקכה כעני כי בלי
הוא בדרתי (יחזקאל מ"ז י'), ומ"ם אין הדד אלא כבוד וחס, ולפיכך:
קסו, גם אחם מביחכם (מנחלתכם, ולכן, בגולה: כי לא זאת לכם 10
הסנוחה, שהרי כעבור סמא את הארץ, ביצח ובערה אהה מחבל ומשהיה
לעמי חבל נחלתו: ואך חבל נמרץ, יגורל מקום ומפורש') סיטי אבותיכם מימי
יהושע בן נון: תחבלי, עקור חבל הוא', כמו חרש, עקור של שורש
דשצצית' וכתנה רבות, וכל הענין כלו מרבר בחלוקת חבל נחלה, וכל
אילו הרעות אחת עושה עי' נביאי השקר שלך שבהם מרבר אל תסופו
יסופון: שלו, אילו על ידי איש הלך רוח וחבל, ושקר כוב אסוף לך דבר 11
שלין ולשבר תענים ושנים ומבוכים, אותו חיות מקבל ויהיה מסיף אל השם
חזה', אבל לפי שנביאי מוכיחים אותם אחר שונאים אותם ואומרים להם
אל תסופו, ודברי לעולם ייטובו לכם, שהרי אספי אספי יעקב כלך 12
מסצרים וקבצתים לפני כצאן כצרה, כצאן מבצר, כחשק, ודתי כצרה
כמו עמק עכור (יהושע כ' י"ז) ועמק יהושעב (יחזקאל כ"ג י'), כרועה עדו
(כעור) בתוך [הרברן], מקום סנוחתו והרברצתו, כמו ידבר עמים תחתו
(תחלים מ"ז ד') יניח וירכין: כן תהפנה, עויכם מרוב ארם, שהרי עלה 13
הפרץ לפניהם, מלאך ששלחתי לפניך לחוריש עממם: פרצו, החוסות.
יעברו', וכן שער הערים ויצאו בו ויעברו מלכם לפניהם, לכבוש להם
הארץ, וכל זה עי' נביאי משה ויהושע, גמצא שרבריי ויטבו לכם על ידי
נביאי, ואהה אומר להם, אל תסופו:

(י) הדברים האלו נשתכחו במי תנא מירוש חתוב שפניו או חסי מה דבר מה.

(י) מה עמי כמו אם כפי חיות את עמי (שמות כ"ב כ'), עי' ר"ק.

(י) הסלית האלה הם חסי ההנהגה.

(י) מה חבל כמו גורל (עי' יהושע י"ז יד): גורל אחי ותכל אהי, ובין כמו מפורש

(י) ר"ל חבל מה שנחלק בתכל היינו חבל נחלה, (i) déradier.

(י) עי' מפרטי ר"ם כי חלבו (במהדורות ע' 45).

(י) וא"כ גם מה כצרה אונתה: שם עי' כיא מלשון מבצרי גדרות גאן, והוא מירוש

התינוק: כעצא בנו תמא, וכן פירש רש"י, ופי' עור מירוש של מחבצתו לעי' להושע א' ח'.

א"י וואל ד' כ'.

נֶגְדִי

- 1 [12] אִמְרֵי-לֵבָב. וְלִבְּנֵי-אִמְרֵי לֵבָב: שְׁמֵעוּ נָא, וְהִבְרִי וְהִנְחִיחוּ. וְהָיָה לֵבָב: לִדְעַת תִּמְשָׁשׁ, לִשְׁמֹעַ יִתְנֹם, וְיִדְרֵךְ סִיד חֹק. סִמְנִי: שְׁמָנִי, מִבֶּן, עַל שְׁמֵעוּ. נָא הָאִשִּׁי בֵּית-וַעֲקֵב סִמְנִי: נוֹלֵד עוֹדִים, עַל בֵּית וַשְׁתָּאֵל: פָּצְחוּ, רִנְיָנָתָם (?): [וַפִּשְׁחָן]. וְזֹאת לָהֶם, מִדֶּה בְּמִדָּה, יִפְרִישׁוּ, וְשִׁשְׁמֹנִי, הֵנָּה וְהֵנָּה (?): בְּצִרְתָּ לִבְכֶּם פְּאִילֵי הוּי (?). בְּסִיד חֹקֶתָ: פֶּאֶשׁ הַחֵנֶּה, מִדֶּה בְּמִדָּה, בְּפִי מִה: שְׁדִרְעוּ מַעֲלִילֵיהֶם לַהֲדִיעַ לַעֲמִי, וְזֹאת לְהִאֲשִׁים, וְלִקְצִינִים: וְעַל דִּבְרָאִים בְּמִסְתַּעֲמִים: אֵת עֲמִי לַהֲדִיעַ, כִּי אִמֶּר יי: הַיִּשְׁכִּים, בְּנֵיהֶם וְאִכְלָם אֹתָם, וּבִכֵּר וְקִרְאוּ לָהֶם שְׁלֹם-מֵאֵתִי: וְאִשֶּׁר לֹא יִתֵּן עַל (?). פִּיֹּהם וְקִשְׁעוּ 6 עֲלֵיהֶם (?). מִלְחָמָה, מֵאֵתִי לְהִתְנַבֵּא לִדְרִיעָה: לִלְלָה לֵבָב, לִלְלָה יִהְיֶה לֵבָב לְחֹדֶךְ 7 וְאִפְּלִי בְּמִחוּנֹכָם: יַעֲמִי, עַל שֹׁשֶׁן, כֹּאכֵי כִי אֵין מַעֲנֵה אֱלֹהִים בְּפִיֹּהם, רִק קִסֵּם וְאִלֵּל וְתִרְמִית לֵבָב, וּבִאֲשֶׁר לֹא יִכָּא וְתִקְוִים הִבְרִם, וְאוֹ כִּשׁ וְתַפְרוֹ: 8 אִבְל אֲנִי, שְׁאֵנִי נִבְּאִי מֵאֵת, מִלְּאֵתִי כִּי אֵת רִחַת יי, וּמִשְׁמַע וּמִבִּרְרָה, וְלֹא קִסֵּם וְתִרְמִית, לְהַגִּיד-לִיעֶקֶב מִשְׁעוֹ, וְלֹא אִירָא, וְלֹא אֶחָת לְחִתּוֹן: לֹחֶם: 10 בְּרִסִּים, שְׁשׁוּפִים וְלֹקֶחֶם בְּתִי, חֲנֻנִים וְזִבְנוֹת, אֹתָם לַעֲשֵׂם, מִגִּדְּלִים וְיִבְרִינִית: וְעַל יי שְׁעִי, שְׁשׁוּשׁוּעִים, הִלָּא יי בְּקִרְבִּנִי, אֵף עַל שְׁאֵנִי, עֲנֻשִׁים 11 וְאִשִּׁי תֹאחַת נַפְשׁוֹ: בְּלִלְלָם, שְׁאֵתָם בּוֹנִין צִוּן בְּרִסִּים וְיִרְשָׁלַם מַעֲלָה: וְהִרְ הִבִּית, שְׁאֵתָם בּוֹשָׁחִים בִּי [לֹאכֵר] הִלָּא יי, בְּקִרְבִּנִי: לְבִסְתָּ נַעֲרִי, לְעֹבֶה יַעֲקֹר, עַד אֲחֵרִית הַיָּמִים:

ד.

- 1 וְזִוְיָה בְּאֲחֵרִית [הַיָּמִים] הָאֵלֶּה, שְׁאֵמֶרֶתִי לְהַגִּילִים וְלִהְשֹׁאוֹת, אֲרִיבָצִם שְׁסִמָּה: יִיחִידֵהּ הִרְ בֵּית יי, שְׁדִיָּה לְבִסְתָּ יַעֲקֹר, נִבְּוִן... אֲנִיבְרִינִי (?). כִּסּוֹ וְהִזְכֵּן וְחִסְדֵּר כִּסָּא (יִשְׁעִיָּה מִ"ז ה'). וְחִתְּבוּנָה יִתְבּוֹנֵן (מִשְׁלִי כִ"ד ג'): בְּרֹאשׁ, בְּנוֹבָה וְהִדְרִים: נִבְּרִי וּמִסִּים: וְנִדְרֵהּ אֵלִי כֹל הַיָּמִים (?). בְּתִקְנָתָם וּמִכְסָּתָם שְׁמִיָּהּ בּוֹ, כִּי בֵּיתִי בֵּית הַפֶּלֶא יִקְרָא לֵל הָעַמִּים (?). וְלֹא יִבְּוֹשׁוּ בְּתַפְלָתָם שְׁמִיָּהּ בְּלִי בּוֹ: וְנִדְרֵהּ, כִּסּוֹ הַכִּסּוֹ אֵלִי וְנִדְרֵהּ וְנִי (הַתְּלִים לִ"ד ו'). וְנִדְרֵהּ יִאֲרִי פִּיֹּהֶם חִלּוֹף חֲפִירָת הַפִּיִּים (?). וְכֵן כֹּל עֵינִי מִזְכִּיר: לִבְּנֵי וְנִעֲלָה אֶל הִר
- (1) בְּבִי יִינֻבִּירִינִי, וְהָיָה מִיֻּבִּירִינִי, וְעַי מִיֻּבִּירִינִי שֶׁל מִכְּבִּירִי לַעֲמִי וְיִתְבּוֹנֵן כִּי יִדְרֵךְ זִמְרָה שְׁחִירָתוֹ שֶׁם.
- (2) מִתֵּר מִלֵּת מִיֻּבִּירִינִי כִּסּוֹ הַחֶלֶק, מִיֻּבִּירִינִי וְנִדְרֵהּ זִוְיָה הָיָה מִיֻּבִּירִינִי הַתְּלִים: וּמִסְתַּעֲמִים וְתַחֲנוּן.
- (3) בְּבִי הִיָּה, (4) בְּבִי אֵל.
- (5) בְּבִי עֲרִיבָתִי, (6) וְהָיָה לֵל הָאֵלֶּה, add.
- (7) בְּחִסּוֹ הִיָּה הַחִסְדֵּר מִהֵאֵת אֵת הַחִסּוֹת בִּישְׁעֵהָ כִּי, בְּכֹס שְׁכִיבִי מִיֻּבִּירִינִי לְבִחּוֹת זֶה
- (8) עַי יִשְׁעֵהָ כִּי יִדְרֵךְ.

- כִּי, יי, וְיִוְרִי מִדְּרָבִי, וְיִשְׁמָעֵל בִּינִינִי אֲחֵרִי: שְׁמֵעִים בְּנֵי כִי מִסְתַּעֲמִים תֹּאחַת לֵלֵי הַחֹדֶה, וְאֵין אֲנִי חֲפִצִּים תּוֹרָה וּמִשְׁמַע וְלֹא חֲפִצִּים מִלְּפָנֶי: וְשִׁמָּה, 3
- הַמִּקְסִים בֵּין עַמִּים רַבִּים הַמִּתְנַתִּים בֵּינֵיהֶם, כְּלֹמֶר דֶּם: וְקִבְּלוּ עֲלֵיהֶם מִשְׁמַע וְדִנִּי יִיחִיד כּוֹאֵב בְּחִיב (?): וְכִתְּחוּ חֲרֻכֹּתָם, שְׁחִירֵי נִלְחָמִים בֵּינֵם וּמִתְנַתִּים הֵן עַל זֶה: לֹאחִים, כִּי בְּמִשְׁמַע אֱלֹהִים יִבְּוֹשׁוּ לִפְנֵי אֵשׁ בּוֹכֹתָם וְזֶה בְּחִיב וְלֹא בְּחִיבִית, וְלֹא יִלְמְדוּ עוֹד מִלְחָמָה, כִּי הַמִּשְׁמַע יִפְרִיד בֵּינֵיהֶם וְחִתּוֹת אֱלֹהִי יַעֲקֹב יִשְׁבִּית מְרִיבֵיהֶם: וְיִשְׁבִּי, וְיִשְׁרָאֵל: וְאִנְחֵנוּ נִלְךְ בֶּשֶׁם יי, וְלֹא 4.5
- בֶּשֶׁם אֱלֹהֵיהֶם: אִסְפָּה, כִּסּוֹ וְאִכְלָה, מִסְעִיר בְּנֵי (בְּרֹאשִׁית כ"ז כ"ח), שְׁאֵלָה 6 אֶחָת עוֹלָה לַעֲקֹר וְלִשְׁשׁוֹשׁ כִּסּוֹ וְאִמְרָה אֵלִי (שֶׁם לִי מִ"א) וְכִתְּנָה רַבּוֹת: הַצִּלְלָה, שְׁחִירֵי אֵילִי הַצִּוּן וְתַחֲרִיתִים בְּקִרְבֵּיהֶם, הֵם הַעֲנֻשִׁים וְהַמִּתְנַתִּים 7 שְׁדִרְעוּ וְהִדְרִיתוּ רֹאשֵׁי הָעָם וְקִצְצִינִים, וְהָאֵתִי: אֲשֶׁר הִרְעִיתִי לָהֶם, אֲקִבֵּן כִּסּוֹ כֵּן, וְמִלֵּךְ יי עֲלֵיהֶם, בְּמִקְסֵם מִקְדָּשָׁא וְהָיָה יַעֲבֹר לְפִנֵּיהֶם, וְכִי יִיחִיד 8 יִדְעָה שְׁלָתָם: וְאֵתִי מִנְדֵּל עֲדֵר [עַפְלָה בִּה צִינִין]. הָיָה מִכְּבִּיר חֹקֶת בִּינִי: 8
- עֲדֵרִי תֹאחַת וְכֹאחֵי (?) הַמִּשְׁמַע הִרְאֻשׁוֹנָה שֶׁל בֵּית דִּיד: וְיִצִּינִי קִרְיָה מִנְדֵּל עֲדֵר, שְׁוֹהָה בֵּית קִרְבִּינִי יִשְׁרָאֵל שְׁרִימָה לַעֲדֵרִי: צִוּן לַמַּעֲלָה, וְהִרְעִיתִי מִנְדֵּל עֲדֵר כִּסּוֹ צִוּן בְּצִרָה וְעַמֵּק עֲבֹר וְעַמֵּק יִהְיֶהשֶׁם (?): עַפְלָה, כִּסּוֹ עַפְלָה וְכִינִי (יִשְׁעִיָּה לִ"ב י"ד). וְיִכָּא אֶל הָעַפְלָה (מִ"א ה' כִּד'): וְעֵתָה, אֲחֵרִי שְׁאֵל בְּאֲחֵרִית הַיָּמִים 9 'חֲרִי' מִסְלַח אֲחֵרִי וּמִסְלַח בֵּית דִּיד קִימָה לֵךְ בְּחֵר צִינִין: לִבְּנֵי חֲרִיָּה רִיעַ, אֲחֵר, שְׁאֵת חִילָתָה לְבִקֵּשׁ עוֹרָה מִסְעִירִים וּמִאֲשֹׁר (?), כִּנּוּן בִּינִי אֲחֵר שְׁחִירֵי בִינִינִי נִתְנַבֵּא: הַמִּלֵּךְ אֵין כֵּן אֵם וְיַעֲצֵן אֲבִי, הֵנָּה יִאֲלִיךְ בְּקִרְבִּי וּמִכְּבוֹת בֵּית דִּיד עֲדִין קִימָה, [1216] וְנִבְּאִי הַמִּלְחָמִים אֲחֵרִי לְהַעֲלִי וְשִׁמְעִי לְקוֹלָם וְלַעֲצָתָם: כִּי הַחֻזֶּק, חִיל כִּיֻּלְדָה, מִפְּנֵי מִלְּכֵי אֲשֹׁר: חִלִּי, 10
- אֵם יִשׁ לֵךְ חִיל כִּיֻּלְדָה, וְחִלִּי וְחִתּוֹתֵי כִיֻּלְדָה (?) מִצִּדִּית מִנְחִירִי, שְׁאֵת עֵתָה אֲחֵרִי וְזֹאת כִּשְׁתָּאֵי מִקְרִית וּשְׁכֵנָה כְּשֹׁדָה זִכְאוֹת עַד כִּבֵּל, שְׁוֹהָה אֲרִיץ רִחֻקָה מֵאֵת, אֵף עַפְלָה שֶׁם תִּנְצֵלִי וְשֶׁם יִנְאֲלִי יי מִיֻּבִּירִינִי, קֵל 'חֲרֻסֶה כְּשִׁעֲרִין לֹא יִצָּאֵת בְּנוֹלָה וְעוֹרֵךְ בְּאֲרֵץ וְלֹא בֹאֵת עוֹרִין בְּכֵן אֵיבִיכִי, וְלִכֵּךְ: לִמֵּה חֲרִיעִי רִיעַ אֲחֵר, וְחֲרִי עֵתָה בִּינִי מִנְחִירִי נִאֲסִי עֲלֵיךְ נִינִי 11 רַבִּים, שְׁכִינִיךְ עִם מִלֵּךְ אֲשֹׁר וְעִם כֹּל כְּבוֹדִי, הַאֲמִירִים בִּלְבָם 'חֲחָה הָאֵת עֲלֵיךְ, תִּתְּנֵן, הִרְי תִּתְּנֵן הָאֲרִיץ בְּרִסִּים וְכַעֲרִיהָ וְכֹא בִינִי הָיָה שְׁחִתּוֹ: בִּינִינִי עֲנִינִי, כִּי לַרְעָתָם קִבְּצִים וְלֹא לְרִיעָתָךְ, אֵלֹא 'כֹּאֵת שְׁכִיבִי עֲפֹרִים לְנִדֹּר לִדְרֹשׁ, וְאֲחֵר שְׁכִיבִים מִכִּיָּה פִּרְתִי וְרִשָּׁה אֹתָם, כֵּן קוֹסִי וְרִשִּׁי בִּת צִינִין כִּי 13 קִרְיָה אֲשִׁים בְּרִל, לִנְחָה כֹּל הַעוֹמֵד בְּפִנִּי, וּפְרִסְתִּיךְ נִחוּשָׁה, לְדֹרֶשׁ, וְחֲרֻקֹת עַמִּים רַבִּים, הַנִּאֲסִים עֲלֵיךְ, וְהַחֲרִמָּה, לִשְׁוֹן הַקִּדְשׁ (?): עֵתָה 14

(1) גַּם זֶה מִתְנַתִּים עִם מִיֻּבִּירִינִי בִישְׁעֵהָ שֶׁם, (2) בְּבִינִי וְכֹאחֵי.

(3) עַי מִיֻּבִּירִינִי לְבִחּוֹת כִּי יִיב, (4) עַי רִשִּׁי וְרִיעַ קִרְיָה.

(5) מִתֵּר נִחוּשָׁה מִיֻּבִּירִינִי כִי אֶתֵּת נִחוּשָׁה מִכְּסֵן (תְּלִים כִּי יי) וְהָיָה מִלְּשׁוֹן יִצְחָק וְרִיעָתָה.

(6) אֲחֵר, תִּתְּנֵן וְרִשִּׁי לְתַלְמִידֵי שֶׁם.

מִכָּה ד-ה

התנודר, ותקנה'. כח גורו, ששם עליו מצור, הוא אשור, על סליה ושריה ועמה שבלי כלם. שהיו בשבט יכו, מן השמים: על הלחי, בביון. כענין כי חתה את כל אויביו לחי (תהלים ג' ח'). את מנהגו מלך אשור, שבא להיות שופט את ישראל לעשות בהם שפטים, המקום יכו על לחי וישבר שני וישכחו אחרי בחימה ובכלמה, וכן הוא אמר וישב כבושת פנים לארצו (דברים לב כ"א). גורו לשון נפל'.

ה.

- 1 ואתה בית לחם אפרתה, מסב על ואתה מנדל עדד (לעיל ד' ח') לחב אומו. אל אחרית הימים, צעיר להיות באלפי יהודה, צעיר ושפל בארץ אויביו להיות מושל באלפי יהודה שבטו, שאף שר אלף לא יהיה בשבטו בגלות; מסך לו יצא להיות מושל, אף בכל ארץ ישראל באחרית הימים. ומסי יצא? סבית לחם יהודה. נקוצאותיו הראשונים
- 2 שיצאו מקום, מורע ישי בית הלחמי הוא דוד. וכן. על אשר הוא צעיר ושפל בגולה ואין לו מסלה לעצור בעמו', יתן ויניח עמו בגלות בארץ שבו. עד עת קץ, שוללה המצירה בחבליה היא ישראל בגולה. ולדה. ותחיה. ועד עת קץ, ששאר אחיו משאר ערי יהודה ישובו לארצם, עם בני ישראל בגלותם, עד אותה העת יהיו צעיר ועמו כיד אויביהם, ואז
- 3 עמד למשול במ ולרעות אחרם, בעז מבטח יי אשר יבטח בו, ואז ישיב אליו' מעט מעט את' שאר בני בגלותם כלם, ועל ידי שימשעו שמלך מלך ביהודה בירושלים סבית דוד ישובו, ופי' ישובו שאמר למעלה ושלא תאמר שישבו קורט שישלך. כי עתה, בהחלת מלכותו לאלתר יגדל עד אפסי ארץ, שיהל המקים לגדלו ולתת פחדו ויראתו על כל העמים אשר ישמעו שמעו וירבו והלו מפניו', ולכן יתנו כלם לכ לשוב אליו מכל
- 4 מקומות תפוצותם: והיה זה שלום, דבר זה שיהיה לאגדה אחת יהיה לשלום ביניהם. שאשור כשבו בארצו, כמחלתה לשוף מרף באייה בעיר יתחברו עליו כלם באגדה אחת. והקטנו עליו שבעה דעים, לגרשו, ושבנה נסכים, מושלים בארם ולא כבדאשנו שהיו ישראל חלוקים ושמוחים איש במלכו חבירו והיו אילו מועטים לעצמם ואילו מועטים לעצמם מלעמור כנגדו: שבעה ושבעה. [128a] כמו חן חלק לשבעה וגם לשבעה (קהלת
- 5 ש"א ב') ולא דוקא: ויעז את ארץ אשור בחרב. אילו הרעים: ארץ

(ז) שורר התנודר מלשון לא תתנודד (דברים י"ד א').

(ז) עי' ראב"ד, ופה כתוב עוד על הגניון: 'והוא שאמר בישעה (י' כ"ה) אל תירא

עמי יושב ציון מאשור בשבט יבכה וג'.

(ז) כבש בעצמו.

(ז) נראה שכתבונו קרא בכתוב ישובו ולא וישבו.

(ז) בבא זא' (ז) לישנא דקרא בדברים ד' כ"ה.

ז' עי' ראב"ד, ופה כתוב

מִכָּה ה-ה

נמירו, היא נינוה וסן וכלל וחתבות עור, שכלם לאשור הוא, כדרכי מן הארץ שהוא יצא אשור (בדאש' י' יא). יצא נמירו לאשור: כפתחיה. עד חשעו ילחמו בם: והניח, מלך דוד את עמו, מאשור: ואם תאמר אך נינוה הגוים אשר הם בקרבם לשון לארצם, לכך נאמר ויהיה שאריות 6 יעקב, הנשואים שלא יצאו ערין, בקרב עמים רבים, שהם בארצם אל' שהם מועטים. כמל וברכבים חיוצאים מאת יי, אשר לא יקרה לאיש, שלא יעקב על ידי מלכו, בן יצאו הם מביניהם מאת יי, בעל כרחם, ולא יקו להם שיתנו להם רשות, שלא יעקבו על ידי לעצא, והוא לשון שאריות ולשון עמים רבים. ואם תאמר יעקבו על ידם לצאת או ירדפו אחריות וחווריות, לכך נאמר והיה שאריות יעקב שבנים בקרב עמים רבים 7 בארץ יהוד בבחכות יער המריכים, אשר אם עבר בנייהם ורסם ומרף אותם ואין מציל, שאין רועה פחדו עליהם ואין נודד בנה גלצפני: ואז תרם 8 ויתיצב כנגדו, ולפיכך יפול פחדו עליהם ואין נודד בנה גלצפני: ואז תרם 8 וחבשנים והפענוגים' והפעלים והמפצות והאמורים כאן והערס והמבצרים 8.10 בומחים בהם, ולכן יכרתו, שלא יהיו לך עוד כמחן אלא במחנני, ולכן חרם ויר על צירך, הברחה' כנגד הברחה, כשיכרתו כל אילן שלא תבטח אלא בי, אז אויבך יכרתו:

ו.

את אשר יי אמר, אלי קום ריב, את עמי, את' הדורים, כלומר 1 במעמד ההרים והגבעות כמי ששפרש ורוא: ששעו הרים את ריב יי 2 עמי: מה עשיתי לך, רעה שזכותי. ומה תלאיתך, והמרתחך בעבורי 3 שהלכת לעבור אלהים אחרים. כי זה עשיתי לך, העליתך מארץ מצרים: 4 משה אהרן, ללמד ולהוריות לאנשים, ומרים, לגשים. להדריך בדרך השובה ולא תחמא: וזר נא מה יעץ עליך בלך מלך מואב בששים לקלך 5 ומה ענה אותו בלעם בן בעור, שאני הייתי מעבד על ידי שלא לקלך מותחתי אותך. וזכר נא המפצות שגמלתך מן השמים ועד שכאת לגלל שכבת את הארץ', שאילו לא גמלתך מוהב אחרת כד' הוא שתעבדני לעולם. ולפיכך זכר אלה שעל כך תרע ותכיר צדקת יי כי צדיק וישר הוא כנגדו, ותאמר צדיק הוא יי. כי במה אקדם יי, על כל אלה המפצות 6 שיהא קרבן הקדמתי כד' לשלום מוכות הללו, האקדמנו בעולות, שיהא כד' הלא כל חית לבנו אין די עולה': ה'דעה יי באלפי אלים ברכבות 7 אלים שנחלי שטן יוצאים מהם' ולכן גמלני מוכות הללו שאבברנו בכל

(ז) כבש והפענוגים. (ז) כבש חבת. (ז) כבש עס.

(ז) עי' ראב"ד, (ז) עי' ישעיה מ' ט"ז.

(ז) דברי המכתב אינם מוכנים כי אין יוצאים חלני שכן מאוירים אם גם נפרש מה אלים

בתור ישון רבים מאלה שהוא יי' (ומורה על זה מה שכתבנו גוים אלים בלא יודי).

מסמכותותם ומסבציותם. זמנו ימחו. אל יי אלהי יסדו: נשא עין, 18
 מסלך עין סגור עינו. יעובר על פשע. כאלו אני רשעו לפני ואני
 אונע בן לשון אל לב: לשאית נחלתו, אשארית מנולות מנדרג. יכבוש, 19
 שלא יראו. במצולות, כאלו במצולות שלא יעלו על לב: יתן אמת, 20
 חקים לענק חסד של אכירם אשר גשעת לאבותיו אוח דחוק ותקיימו
 לענק:

נחום אקמושי. ישחק מורשי:

נחום.

א.

לא נאמר משא על שם הנביא כמו דברי ירמיהו (ירמיה א' א') חזון ישעיהו
 (ישעיה א' א') אלא על שם הני והממלכה כמו משא מואב (שם פ"א)
 משא דמשק (שם י"א א'): ספר, סיפור. חזון נחום, שסיפר ובישר לישראל
 על מפלת אויבו שדוד לו, כי לספר ולבשר להם נאמר לו החזון ולכן
 נקרא ספר: אל קנא נוקם יי, דעו ישראל אע"פ ששולח ונדלה יש לו 2
 לאשור ורוד לכן יוחר סכל, כי המקום יקנא לכן וינקם נקמתם כי
 אל קנא נוקם הוא, נקם גומר. בלב לאויביו, ומה שחשק להם, לפי ש"י 3
 אל אך אפים נדל כח, ולא משפלות ידים הוא מאריך לאויביו כי נדל
 כח הוא וסוף שלא יקם אותם מיד מעלליהם². ונקח לא ינקח, כמו
 ואכל לא האכלוהו (ויקרא י' כ"ד) כלשון בני אדם. יי: בסופה ובמסערה
 דחכו, לבא ולסדע מהם. אבק רגליו, קדקד רגליו: נער, בים, בועמ 4
 בקומו למשפט על הני והממלכה: אסל, דימוני³. בשן וברמל, הרים
 גבורים הן כמו הר אלהים הר בשן (תהלים כ"ח פ"ז): והשא (האריך מפניו). 5
 נבהה ועמדה, כמו מפני שיבה תקום (ויקרא י"ט ל"ב): נחצו, כמו נחתצו 6
 מלשון ונתן את הכית (שם י"ד פ"ה): ובתוך חמתו ושאנו ומשפטו וועמי.
 טוב יי למענו, מבצר מבטח ביום צרה, לאהביו: יודע, ומשם לבו לדון 7
 מי הם החוסים בו ולא יתן המסחות לבוא בבתיהם לנגוף⁴: כי כסתר כנפיו

(1) כי נחום נחמא אחרי יונה יאמר גם הנהגות: מלקיטין אתני עליה יונה פר
 אמתי... חכ ואתני עליה נחום מביט קושי וקעי רש"י, אבל פי הוא התנבא כיפי אחו
 ויחזקתו זה חתנני לדברי ח"ץ כסוד עולם פרק כ' שש נאמר כי יואל נחום וחזקו נחמא
 בימי מנשה נע"י ר"ק.
 (2) ע"י רש"י. (3) אוממה י"ד מושל ונבוע.
 (4) ע"י שמואל י"ב כ"ב.

7 סצפה ואחרי ליום פקודה ומי יעסר לי ואני. אחרי שאין לי מי יעסר
 לי בקרן. כ"י אצמח, אפלה בא בור יי, כי רבו דחמיו וביד אדם לא
 אפלה¹, ובמחזיוני כי ישמעתי אלהי, ייחוד לי ארך אפים ורב חסד במשפט
 8 ולא כחמאי ועשה לי: אל תשחקו אויבתי לי. הם עמים רבים שנאספו
 ועלו² עם מנדרב האומות³: תחנף ותחו בציון עינינו (לעיל ד' י"א) כי
 אם נפליהו, שסנדרב תפס כל ערי יעזרה הבצורות והלך ושטף: קסחו, ששכ
 כבושת פנים לארצו, וכל חילו נפלו פגרים מותם⁴. כמו שאשכ כחושך
 9 עתה יי אוי לי לבסוף: ועפ יי אשא ואמכול כי תמאני לי, שמירוק עין
 10 הוא ולא לשדוח. עד אשר יריב ריב: נעשה משפט, מסנדרב: ותרא
 אויבתי האומרה בלכבה עתה איח יי אלהיך, את משפט אלהים ונקמתו
 שיקום לי, ותכסה בושה: סמה שדחתה סבורה לראות כי, עני היראנה
 בה, ולא כמו שדוא אומרת תחו בציון עני, שעתה תודה לי לפרסם כשם
 הוצות, כימי חזקתו, בדכתיב הוא הכה את פלשתים עד עזה ואת גבוליה
 מסנדרב נצרים עד עיר מצר (מ"ב י"ח ח'). וכתיב וינשא לעינו כל הנוים
 11 מאחרי כן (ד"ה ל"ב כ"ג): יום לבנות נדריך, שיכנה המקום נדריך
 הפורצים, יום ההוא ירחק חק, אויבך, שתפסק סחם נדולה ופסכות⁵.
 12 יום הוא שעדך יבא, הצר והאויב יוכנע לפניך, ומי סחם שיכנעו לך
 ויבאו עידי לטני אשר וכל ערי מצור שלי, כגון גינה העיר הנדולה
 וחברותיה רכן וכלל ורחכות עיר, ולקני עיר מצור ועד נדר מרת⁶. וים.
 ועד ים, מים, כלומר מים. ועד ים, וכענין וירד מים עד ים ומנחר עד
 אפסי ארץ (תהלים ע"ב ח'). וכן הוא אומר ושתי גבולך מים סוף ועד
 פלשתים ומסדבר ועד הנהר (שם כ"ז ל"ג): והיתה, הארץ שלהם לשטמה
 13 סדברתם, כמו וקודש הקדשים (שם כ"ז ל"ג): והיתה, הארץ שלהם לשטמה
 על יושביה. אויבך, ספרי מעללים, שעשו לך, ועל דבר זה מצא לו
 14 הנביא מקום להתפלל עליהם⁷: רעה עמך בשכנך, חוסרם אתה ודורם
 הדרך הטובה והישרה, להיות שכני לבדך, לבסוף⁸. יער בתוך כרמל⁹.
 15 כימי עולם, כימי דוד ושלמה: אראנו נפלאות, שדודה להם מסילה בים
 16 ויבנהו לעבוד ברנליו, כמו שספורש בישעיה (י"א פ"ז): וישמו יד על פה.
 17 שלא להשיב לישראל¹⁰, וכאילו אוננים תחרשנה לפניהם, שאינם שומעים,
 להשקתו ואני כהרש לא אשמע וני (תהלים לח י"ד): ילחכו עפר כנחש,
 להשתחוו לישוראל, כענין אפים ארץ ישתחו לך וני (ישעיה מ"ט כ"ג).
 וכן הוא אומר ואויביו עפר ילחכו (תהלים ע"ב ט'): לפי שפחדו וימנו

(1) ע"י שמואל כ' כ"ד י"ד.
 (2) כפי עלו. (3) כפי האומר.
 (4) ע"י התיב י"ב כ"א. (5) ע"י רש"י. (6) כפי פוס.
 (7) ע"י התיב י"ב כ"א. (8) כפי פוס.
 (9) ע"י רש"י ור"י קרא.
 (10) חסר מנחם הפורש לחיים אלו, אבל ע"י ר"י קרא.
 (11) כפי ישראל.

Commentary of Eliezer of Beaugency on Micah

Chapter 1

1:1. The Morashtite: From Mareshah,⁶ as in its Targum.

1:2. Every place where it speaks of "hearing," "paying attention," or "listening" with respect to people, or heaven and earth, it is concerned with judgment (cf. 3:1; 6:1 and 2). My testimony is a witness against you: To admonish and warn you if you do not repent.

1:3. And he will tread upon the high ones of the land:⁷ He will humble and make lowly all the boastful and haughty.

1:4. Like wax: He calls every kind of oil "wax." This relates to "they will melt."

1:5. And who are the high ones of Judah:⁸ Those he will tread upon and make lowly.⁹

1:6. A heap in the open country: A pile of refuse in a field¹⁰ where there is no inhabitant. And I will pour down her stones into the valley: As water is poured out (cf. 1:4).

1:7. And all her hires: Desirable things: silver, gold, embroidery, and precious stones which she procured for her idols. For from the hire of a harlot she gathered them: This is Samaria, the hires of her idols with whom she committed idolatry. And unto the hire of a harlot: That is to say, their end is the same as the hire of a harlot--to be lost and burned.

1:8. But for this I will lament and wail; I will go about confused:¹¹ In the vernacular, éstordiz,¹² in dismay.

1:9. For the wound of Samaria is incurable: So much so that it reaches even "unto the gate of my people, even Jerusalem." On account of this, one should mourn since Judah and Jerusalem have become affected by it.

1:10. Tell it not in Gath: The wound of Jerusalem (cf. 1:9). "Lest the daughters of the Philistines rejoice" (2 Sam 1:20) and come upon us. There is a play on the words גַּח and גֹּחַ. In the house of Ophrah: Formerly from Ophrah (cf. 1 Chr 4:14?). You came in secret and not openly. There is a play on the words עֶפֶר and עֶפְרָה.

1:11. Pass on your way: Depart from your place. Inhabitants of Shaphir: Unveiled (גִּילּוּי) as (in Job 26:13), "By his wind the heavens are made fair (שֶׁפֶרָה);" and (Gen 49:21), אִמְרֵי שֶׁפֶרָה, ¹⁴ that is, open (מְגֹלִים) words. And thus he says, cease from lamenting and mourning, in an exposed place which can be seen and heard by the gentiles. Because of nakedness and shame: Because of the unveiling ¹⁵ of shame, that it should not be unveiled to the enemy. עֲרִיָה as (in Hab 3:9), "You uncover your bow"; which is interpreted as "Your bow is surely uncovered."¹⁶ Also O inhabitant of Zaanan: A place where sheep regularly go out to pasture.¹⁷ You are warned that you should not go out weeping and mourning. There is a play on the words יִצְאָה and צֹאֲנָן. And why so much concerning mourning? Because when you mourn in a place near a local enemy,¹⁸ he will stir up and come and "take away his support," thus the cities that the kings of Israel and Judah took from him who was resisting them: for example, the cities of Moab and Gilead which reverted to them in the exile of Israel, and also the cities of the Philistines in the exile of Judah.¹⁹ יְדֻמָּה in the vernacular, son estal.²⁰

1:12. For they wait anxiously for good: The "inhabitant of Maroth" waits anxiously for amends. [Maroth] as (in Jer 50:21), "Go up against the land of Merathaim." They are the Philistines who dwell beside them and continually rebel and revolt against the kings of Judah;²¹ their luck begins to increase and she begins to

amend the misdeeds that the kings of Judah did unto her.
Because evil has come down from the Lord: Who had treated them well. And when calamity comes to Jerusalem, it is good for Philistia, the inhabitant of Maroth and their rebellion. 1107, in the vernacular, a deamender.²²

1:13. Harness, in the vernacular, atteléz.²³ Binding and coupling to the horse, and the bull to the coach is called "harnessing." And thus he says, "Bind the chariot to the team of horses." Run quickly, "O inhabitant of Lachish," to escape and flee from the King of Assyria. Steeds, as (in Esth 8:14), "Mounted on their swift horses." The creature is very swift of foot. There is a play on the words רכש and לכיש. It was²⁴ the beginning of sin: The chariot, "to the Daughter of Zion:" For in you: Zion. Were found the transgressions of Israel: At the beginning. For Solomon increased for himself chariots, horses, and foreign wives; and because of them he sinned by committing idolatry. Then his kingdom was divided and they sinned by means of the calves of Jeroboam. In Zion "were found" the beginning "of the sins of Israel."

1:14. Therefore: Because at the beginning "the sins of Israel were found in you" (1:13), by means of foreign women. You shall give: Your cities. As parting gifts: To foreign nations, for they will seize your cities as parting gifts of the daughters whom Solomon married, when you were exiled from your land, except "Moresbeth-Gath," which returned to her the land of her inheritance that the kings of Judah had taken from her. Parting gifts: Gifts that a man gives to his daughter when he sends her from his home to her husband, as (in 1 Kgs 9:16), "And had given it as dowry to his daughter, Solomon's wife." and (Ex 18:2), "After he had sent her away"²⁵ and similar passages. Also, the houses of

Achzib:²⁶ This is a place, as (in Gen 38:5), "She was in Chezib when she bore him." And thus he says, "The houses of Achzib," which are high and lofty. They will be deceitful and false to the kings of Israel, and they will not be saved by them. There is a play on the words כזיב and כזב . Deceitful, in the vernacular, faillance;²⁷ as (in Jer 15:18), "Wilt thou be to me like a deceitful brook?"²⁸ And thus in every form of כזב ; as also (in Isa 58:11), "(Like a spring of water) whose waters fail not."

1:15. Again a conqueror: Who had possession of the land at the beginning, "I will bring against you, O inhabitant of Mareshah." "Unto Adullam will come" the conqueror to take possession "of the glory of Israel," and his strength which is in that land.²⁹ The glory of Israel: This refers to Mareshah and Adullam, saying Mareshah and Adullam because they were the "glory of Israel," and his strength is on that side.³⁰ Everything the first conqueror will take possession of as at the beginning. Shall come: This relates to "I will bring," because the conqueror says, "I will bring." There is a play on the words יורש and מורשה.

1:16. Make yourselves bald: By hand. And cut off (your hair): By an instrument, as in the fashion of mourning. As the eagle: Which is made bald and its feathers are plucked, and yet he grows others. This is as it says (in Ps 103:3),³¹ "So that your youth is renewed like the eagle's." For they shall go from you: Because the first conqueror has taken possession of you (1:15).

Chapter 2

2:1. "And they work iniquity"³² in their plans;" when they rise early in the morning, they perform their evil plan. Because it is in the power of their hand: And with all competence they

do it, and they do not restrain themselves.

2:3. Behold, I am devising [evil]: Against your plans. And you shall not walk haughtily: Erect. For your rebellious deeds shall be upon your neck, and they shall cause your strength to fail. For it will be an evil time: For you. And your luck will become weak.

2:4. They will take up a taunt song against you: Those who mourn. We are utterly ruined (שָׁדוֹן נִשְׁדוֹן): שָׁדוֹן as (in 2 Sam 6:22),³³ וְנִקְלוּתִי עוֹד, [the niph'al] is as [the qal,] קְלוּתִי. The nun is as [in the forms] נִמְבֹּזָה וְנִמָּס (1 Sam 15:9) and וְנִהְפָּזָה הוּא (Esth 9:1).³⁴ Alas, for most certainly the enemies "have completely destroyed us." The portion that was his will be allotted to my people in his land. He changes: So that aliens and strangers divide it in his stead. How removes it again: and the enemy turns aside from there. From me (לִי): With respect to me (עָלַי). For behold, "to the rebellious," in order to separate us from the land, "he divides our fields" to our enemies, as though we will never again return to the land. שְׁבִיבָה is always the terminology of exile and separation, [as] (in Jer 50:6),³⁵ "From mountain to hill they have gone" and (Ps 23:3), "He restores my soul." If he separates me and causes me to wander from the good pasture, he will lead me back again in the "paths of righteousness" (Ps 23:3) to the pasture.

2:5. Therefore: Because now "they oppress a man and his house, a man and his inheritance (2:2)." You will not have an heir in the land assigning a portion by lot, but strangers will apportion it.

2:6. "Do not preach"--thus they preach: The false prophets say to my prophets.³⁶ Surely it is fitting that my

prophets should not preach to those who are nothing but scorers of their words. And the prophet "is not overtaken [by disgrace]."

2:7. Should this be said, O house of Jacob? For is it fitting that this word should be spoken in the house of Jacob--for I have always treated them well--that it is said to my prophets that that they should not prophesy and should not preach to them? Is the spirit of the Lord impatient? Perhaps I spoke to them through my prophets by my Spirit, to whom I gave a word, and it did not come to pass or was not fulfilled? Or perhaps these are his deeds and works with regard to them, for in judgment they say to my prophets that they did not prophesy from me, so then they are my deeds with them. Do not my words: Which I spoke through my prophets, always "treat him well who walks uprightly" and performs justice. Thus why was this word spoken in the house of Jacob? בית יעקב: This is the same as בית יעקב, as it occurs many times in scripture.

2:8. ואתמול ³⁷: Against my prophets the false prophet "raises my people as an enemy," because they mislead my people by by their falseness and wickedness to hate my prophets because of my words spoken to them in my name. They do good for them (cf. 2:7) because they cause good and not evil, (as in Ps 120:7), "I am for peace; but when I speak, they are for war!" Thus do not say that their prophets and leaders and judges do good for my people. No because from the front of the robe: Where the poor has nothing but a robe with which to cover his flesh, for in the night he covers it over with a coat for the sake of modesty lest his robe be seen upon his flesh; from there the one who passes on quietly is stripped of his coat. Those who pass by: Resting "from battle" because they imagined they were at peace with them

and they were not on their guard.

2:9. The women of my people: The poor, you drive out from the pleasant house; although there is nothing in it for you.

From their young children you take away my glory: That I placed upon them, which is not yours. Forever: Indefinitely. My glory: This refers to embroidered garments, (as in Ezek 16:14), "For it was perfect through the splendour which I bestowed upon you." In any case, there is no glory without honour and grace.

2:10. And therefore rise up: Even you from your house and from your inheritance. And go: Into exile. For this is no place to rest: Because of the defiling of the land by murder and lewdness, you destroy and spoil for my people the share of their inheritance. Also, a strong portion:³⁸ A certified and specific lot from the days of your fathers, from the days of Joshua son of Nun. החבל : The uprooting of the חבל , just as השרש (cf. Job 31:12) is the uprooting of שורש. החבל , in the vernacular, déraciner.³⁹ It occurs like this many times. And in all the contexts it speaks concerning the distribution of the allotment of the inheritance. And all of these evils you do through your false prophets about whom it says, "'Do not preach' they preach" (2:6). For "if"⁴⁰ a man should walk after the wind" and vanity, and "tells a falsehood" [saying], "I will prophesy to you" a matter concerning "wine and strong drink," that leads astray, causing one to err and lie; you would receive him and "he would be a spokesman for his people." But because my prophets rebuke you, you hate them and say to them, "Do not preach: (2:6). Yet my words are beneficial for you forever (cf. 2:7).

2:12. For I will surely gather all of you O house of Jacob: From Egypt. You will collect them⁴¹ before as sheep in a fold: As

enclosed sheep, quietly. For "in a fold" is like "Valley of Achor" (Hos 2:17 [2:15]) and "Valley of Jehoshaphat" (Joel 4:2 [3:21]). Like a shepherd of his flock; as a flock in the midst⁴² of a quiet and restful place; as (in Ps 47:4), "He chose our inheritance for us." He brings [them] to rest and causes [them] to lie down. Thus you are tumultuous,⁴³ your cities because of the multitude of men.

2:13. For He who opens the breach will go up before them: The angel whom I sent before you so that you drive out the peoples. They will break through: The walls. And pass: The gate of the cities and leave by it. Their King will pass on before them: In order to conquer the land for them. And all this comes through my prophets Moses and Joshua.⁴⁴ The result is that my words are beneficial for you through my prophets (cf. 2:7); and yet you say to them, "Do not preach (2:6)."

Chapter 3

3:1. And saying: To you. And therefore I say to you, "Hear now:" My words and my reproof. Is it not for you to know justice? To bring justice for the orphan and the oppressed from the hand of one stronger than he.

3:2. You who hate the good: This refers to "Hear now, you heads of Jacob" (3:1). Who tear their skin: This refers to those of "the house of Israel" (3:1).⁴⁵

3:3. And break [their bones] into-pieces:⁴⁶ פצחו, in the vernacular, rongerent:⁴⁷ this is reprisal for them. And chop them up: So that they dart about here and there in the distress of their heart⁴⁸ as if they were in a boiling pot.

3:4. Because they have made [their deeds] evil: Reprisal

according to the evil which they do to my people. This is addressed to the rulers and leaders.

3:5. And concerning the prophets who lead my people astray: To do evil. Thus says the Lord: "Those who bite with their teeth" and eat with them, and thereby "they proclaim" for them "peace" from me. "And those who put nothing into their mouths:" "They declare holy war against him"⁴⁹ from me by prophesying disaster against him.

3:6. It shall be night to you: It will be night for you and darkness and gloom⁵⁰ without a vision.

3:7. They shall cover their lips: Like a mourner; for there is not a divine answer in their mouths, only magic, idolatry, and the deceit of their heart. And when their word does not come to pass and is not fulfilled, then they become ashamed and embarrassed.

3:8. But⁵¹ "as for me." Because I am a true prophet; I am filled with power, with the spirit of the Lord and with justice and might: And not magic and deceit. To declare to Jacob his transgression: I will not be afraid, and I will not be terrified into flattering them.

3:10. With blood: Which they spill, and they take the houses of the poor and use them to build for themselves towers and citadels.

3:11. Yet they lean upon the Lord: So that he may deliver them. Is not the Lord in our midst? Even though each of us does what he wants.

3:12. Because of you: Because you "build Zion with bloodshed and Jerusalem with violence" (3:10). And the mountain of the house:⁵² Because you trust in it [saying], "Is not the Lord in

our midst?" (3:11) A wooded height: To a height in a scrub of a forest. Until the latter days.

Chapter 4

4:1. It shall come to pass in the latter days: For I had planned to banish them in exile and to make your land a desolation. That the mountain of the house of the Lord: Which had become a "wooded height" (3:12). Shall be established: In the vernacular, adrèzé.⁵³ This is like (Isa 16:5), "Then a throne will be established" and (Prov 24:3), "And by understanding it is established." As the highest: As a summit of a mountain is recognized and well-known. And all the nations will be radiant in it:⁵⁴ In hope and trust because they will trust in it.⁵⁵ For my house will be called a house of prayer for all nations (cf. Isa 56:7), and they will not be disappointed in their prayer which they pray in it. And they will be radiant,⁵⁶ as (in Ps 34:6), "Look to him, and be radiant; so your faces shall never be ashamed." And they will be enlightened, their faces will shine, the shame of their faces will be reversed. And this is proven in every context.

4:2. Therefore let us go up to the mountain of the house the Lord: "That he may teach us his ways." And he will judge between us after we are delivered by him. For out of Zion shall go forth the law: For us. And we have no desire for teaching and judgment except it goes forth from him.

4:3. And he shall judge: God [judges] between many nations, who contend among themselves; that is to say, they receive for themselves together his judgment and verdict as worthy of guilt. And they shall beat their swords: Because they were waging war with them and struggling one against the other.

Into ploughshares: For with divine justice they shall come to be acquitted, each man with his own acquittal and not by a sword or a spear. Neither shall they learn war any more: For the judgment will distinguish between them and the Law of the God of Jacob will put an end to their strife.

4:4. But they shall sit: Israel.

4:5. But we will walk in the name of the Lord: Not in the name of their gods.

4:6. and 7. אספה , this is as ואכלה מצייד בני (Gen 27:25). That is, the one 'aleph serves for both the root letter and the prefix. As (in Gen 46:31)⁵⁷ ואמרה אלין , and many other times in Scripture. The lame: The rams of the flock and their goats have been smitten with their horns. They are the poor and the destitute which the leaders of the people and their judges drive out and expel: Those whom I have afflicted: Likewise "I will gather" and "the Lord will rule over them" in his Holy Place, and he will "Pass before them" (2:13). And who will be their shepherd?

4:8. And you, O tower of the flock: [Hill of the daughter of Zion]⁵⁸ the stronghold of the daughter of Zion. To you shall it come, the former dominion shall come: Of the house of David. And he calls Zion "tower of the flock" because it was the house of the community of Israel; thus he likens it above to a flock of sheep, for the "tower of the flock" is as "sheep of a fold" and "Valley of Achor" (Hos 2:17 [2:15]), and "Valley of Jehoshaphat" (Joel 4:2 [3:21]). עפל as (in Isa 32:14), "The hill and the watchtower," and (2 Kgs 5:24)⁵⁹ "And when he came to the hill."

4:9. Now: Since also in the latter days the kingdom of your God and the kingdom of the house of David shall be established⁶⁰ in Mount Zion. Why do you cry out aloud? Afterward,

for you go to seek help from Egypt and Assyria; as, for example, in the days of Ahaz when it was prophesied, "Is there no king in you? Has your counselor perished?" For your God is still in your midst and the kingdom of the house of David is yet established, and my prophets who teach you for [your] benefit. Therefore, hearken to their voice and their counsel. That pangs have seized you like a woman in travail: Because of the kings of Assyria.

4:10. Writhe: Since you have pain like a woman in childbirth. And groan: Then you will give birth and feel relief, like a woman in childbirth; because of the calamity of Sennacherib. For also now after this when you shall "go forth from the city and dwell in the open country; you shall come to Babylon," for it is a distant land. Nevertheless, "there you shall be rescued, there the Lord will redeem you from the hand of your enemies." On the principle of interpretation "from minor to major"⁶¹ (לך וחרור) this must be inferred since you have not yet gone into exile and you are still in your land, and you have not yet gone into the hand of your enemies. So therefore "why do you cry out" afterward?

4:11. For now in the days of Sennacherib many nations are assembled against you: Your neighbours with the King of Assyria and all his glory. Who say in their heart, "Ah! Ah!" against you. Let her be profaned: For the land is polluted by blood and nakedness; and the day has come "when our eye gazes upon Zion." And this is the day that wait for when we think your end has come.

4:12. But they do not know the thoughts of the Lord: For he gathered them for their destruction, and not your destruction. But as a man gathers sheaves to the threshing floor: To thresh; and after he gathers them, he brings his cow and she threshes them.

4:13. Thus, arise and thresh, O daughter of Zion, for I will make your horn iron: To gore all who stand before you. And your hoofs I will make bronze: In order to thresh. You shall beat in pieces many peoples: Those who are gathered against you.

והחרמתי : This is a term of consecration.

4:14. Now you shall cut yourself:⁶² You shall shear yourself. Daughter of Marauders:⁶³ Because "he lays siege against us";--that is,⁶⁴ Assyria--against her kings, her princes, and her people; all of them have perished. For, with a rod they strike: From heaven. Upon the cheek: In disgrace; as, for example (Ps 3:8 [3:7]), "for thou dost smite all my enemies on the cheek." [They strike] Sennacherib, King of Assyria, because he had come⁶⁵ to appoint judges among them to judge Israel. God strikes his cheek⁶⁶ and breaks his teeth, and causes him to return in disgrace and ignominy. And thus it says (in 2 Chr 32:21), "So he returned with shame of face to his own land." There is a play on words with נִיטָא .

Chapter 5

5:1. But you, O Bethlehem Ephrathah: This relates to "and you, O tower of the flock" (4:8). To change it to the latter days. Who is too little to be among the clans of Judah: Small and lowly in the land of his enemies, to be ruler even among the clans of Judah, his tribe, because there will not be⁶⁷ even a captain of a clan in his tribe in the exile. From you shall come forth for me one who is to be the ruler: Even throughout all the land of Israel in the latter days. And from where will he go forth? From Bethlehem.⁶⁸ And his origins: These are the ancients who emerged from of old, from the seed of Jesse the Bethlehemite, that is David.

5:2. Therefore: Because he is small and lowly in the exile and he has no dominion to rule his people.⁶⁹ He will put: That is, set his people at rest: in the exile, in the land of his captors. "Until the time" of the end when "she who is in labour" gives birth; in her pain. She is Israel in the exile. Has brought forth: And will feel relief. And "until the time" of the end when the "remnant of his brothers" from the rest of the cities of Judah return to their land, with the "sons of Israel" from their exile. Until that time they will be small and his people will be in the hand of their enemy.⁷⁰

5:3. And then he shall stand: To rule over them and shepherd them "in the strength" of the trust of the Lord in whom he will trust. Then they will return:⁷¹ To him gradually, then all the rest of the sons of their exile will return because they hear that a king rules in Judah and Jerusalem from the house of David.⁷² ישובן : Which should be interpreted as ישובון above, and not as some say that they will return before he becomes king. For now: At once, at the beginning of his kingdom. He shall be great to the ends of the earth: Because God begins to make him great and puts the dread and fear of him among all the nations who will hear reports of him, and they will become agitated and anxious because of him. Therefore all of them put their mind to return to him from all the places to which they have been dispersed.

5:4. And this shall be peace: The word נח is used because they will be as one group for peace between them. For Assyria when he comes into our land: When he begins to prey as a lion in a sheepfold, all of them will unite against him, as one group.⁷³ That we will raise against him seven shepherds: In order

to drive him out. And eight princes of men: Leaders over men. And not as at first when Israel was divided and each rejoiced in the fall of his neighbour, and these decreased in strength so that they could not oppose him. "Seven" and "eight" as (in Qoh 11:2), "Give a portion to seven, or even to eight," and not as a precise number.

5:5. They shall shepherd the land of Assyria with a sword: These are the shepherds. And the land of Nimrod: This is Nineveh, Resen, Calah, and Rehoboth-Ir. (cf. Gen 10:11 and 12). All of them belong to Assyria, as it is written, "From that land he went to Assyria," Nimrod went to Assyria. בפניהם : Unto the gate they will make war with them. He shall deliver:⁷⁵ The Davidic king will deliver his people from Assyria. And if you should ask how the nations among whom they live will allow them to return to their land: therefore, it continues,

5:6. Then the remnant of Jacob shall be: Those who remained who have not yet gone forth. In the midst of many peoples: For they were in their land, although they were few in number. "As dew" and "rain". Go forth "from the Lord." Which tarry not for men: For they are not prevented by him from going forth, thus they will go forth among them from the Lord, unwillingly, and they will not wait for them that they should give them permission, for they will not be hindered by them from leaving. It is an expression of "remnant" and "many people." And if you say they are prevented by them to leave, or pursued after and brought back, then the text continues:

5:7. "And the remnant of Jacob shall be in the midst of nations and in the midst of many people" as a single "lion in the midst of numerous beasts of a forest"; which if it passes among

them, it tramples and devours them and there is no rescuer. For there is no shepherd to rescue the beasts of a forest, and even among flocks of sheep who can stand against it? And hence dread of him will fall upon them, "and there is none that moved a wing, or opened the mouth" (Isa 10:14).⁷⁶

5:8-13. And then your hand shall be lifted up against your adversaries: The horses and chariots which are mentioned here, and the cities, fortresses, sorcerers, magicians, idols, sacred images, and Asherism, all of them in which they had previously trusted, therefore they shall be cut off. For they will not be an object of trust for you any more, but [there will only be] trust in me. Therefore, your hand shall be lifted up against your adversaries: Annihilation facing annihilation, when all those things shall be cut off, which you should not trust in, only me [you should trust in], then your adversaries shall be cut off.

Chapter 6

6:1-4. What the Lord says: Unto me. Arise, plead your case: With my people. Before the mountains: As though to say, in the presence of the mountains and the hills, as it is rightly understood. Hear, you mountains, the controversy of the Lord: With his people. What have I done to you? What evil, that you have forsaken me. In what way have I wearied you? And have I burdened you with my worship that you go to serve other gods? For this is what I have done for you: "I brought you up from the land of Egypt." Moses and Aaron: To teach and instruct the men. Miriam: [To teach] the women. [These were given] to direct you in in the good way, so that you do not sin.⁷⁷

6:5. Remember what Balak King of Moab devised: At Shittim

to curse you. And what Balaam the son of Beor answered him: That "I was hindered by him" (Num. 22:13) from cursing you, because of my love for you. And remember the good things with which I rewarded you "from Shittim until you came to Gilgal," so that you might conquer the land. For whereas I did not give you other good things corresponding to it, so that you would serve me forever. Therefore, remember these things because this you know and thus you recognize "the saving acts of the Lord." For he is righteous and upright with respect to you, and thus you should say, "The Lord is righteous."

6:6. With what shall I come before the Lord: Concerning all these good things; what offering shall be sufficient that I should come before him to recompense him for these things. Shall I come before him with burnt offerings: For all the animals of Lebanon will not be sufficient for a burnt offering (cf. Isa 40:16).

6:7. Is the Lord pleased with thousands of oaks, with myriads of oaks from which rivers of oil flow?⁷⁸ He has rewarded me with all these good things so that I may honour him. And if I should sin against him, perhaps I should give to him "my first born" for a burnt offering? Then he will be pleased with me because in this he delights; and the "fruit of my body" I will offer him on account of the "sin of my soul." No, he is not pleased with this! All this you recognize and know.

6:8. Perhaps A man has shown you what is good:⁷⁹ In his own eyes; all which is yours, you shall give him. And what does the Lord require of you? From your money. This thing only [is required], to do justice: Between a man and his neighbour. And to love kindness: To the poor and the needy. Humbly: In conduct. To walk with your God: Behaving towards him with reverence, glory,

and holiness. פִּזְיוֹן , in the vernacular, simplicite,⁸⁰ as (in Prov 11:2), "But with the humble is wisdom." And what does the Lord require of you: This is the word of the prophet which he said to Israel, and it does not refer to the one "who has told you what is good" [in his own eyes].

6:9. The voice of the Lord cries to the city: Like a king who besieges a city calls them to pay that they should return and assemble before him for judgment at the appointed day. And it is sound wisdom: Judgment and righteousness⁸¹ come to look upon⁸² your name, because he hears the evil name before him from you. This is like (Gen 18:21), "I will go down to see whether they have done altogether according to the outcry which has come to me; and if not, I will know." שִׁמְךָ as (in Ezek 16:14), "And your renown went forth among the nations" and (1 Kgs 5:11 [4:31]). "And his fame was in all the nations."⁸³ Hear, O Tribe: The rebuke, because he shall rebuke you if you do not repent. And who has appointed it yet? The city for judgment before him for sound wisdom and other justice, because he begins to strike them with his staff. Therefore, it is better to repent beforehand; thus they ask and inquire:

6:10. Are there⁸⁴ still treasures of wickedness in the house of the wicked?⁸⁵ Ultimately [the wicked] will be found guilty by them. And the scant measure: It was deficient because it was measured for others. For it is cursed: And despised in the eyes of God. And the injustice will be brought back upon his hand, so long as they were in my hand.

6:11. Shall I acquit: Before God, thus you say among yourselves.

6:12. Whose rich men: In her midst; this refers to the

"voice of the Lord calling to the city (6:9)." Because the rich men in her midst are filled and become rich by violence.

6:13. Therefore I have caused you to become ill by striking you because of your sins:⁸⁶ If you do not repent because of the striking. Making you desolate: Because evildoers cause desolation for you.

6:14. Because you shall eat, but not be satisfied: Tit for tat, corresponding to the ephah and scant measure. It may also be said "making you desolate," as (in Ezek 3:15), "overwhelmed among them."⁸⁷ And there shall be hunger: The food is stirred up and rumbles in your midst, that is, in your belly, until you vomit it up. וישחר ,⁸⁸ as (in Ps 42:6), "My soul is cast down within me." In the vernacular, abattment.⁸⁹ You shall put away: Turn back because of your enemies. And you shall not escape:⁹⁰ One who has escaped. And whoever you rescue, I will give to the sword: Either by your hand or the hand of another. It is like (1 Kgs 19:17), "And him who escapes from the sword of Hazael shall Jehu slay."

6:15. But not reap: Because your enemies will eat it.⁹¹

6:16. Because you have kept: The one who escaped among you. The statutes of Omri: Walking in them, and not taking instruction from his companions who have fallen by the sword, by the hand of their enemies. The scorn of my people: Who shall be "a desolation" and "a hissing" for all who pass by, near you. You shall bear [it]. For you the enemies shall insult, by what they say to the people every day: "Where is your king, princes, and those who save you in all your cities?" (Cf. 4:9; Jer 3:28.) The king, princes, and great men of the people were found to be bearers of the reproaches of the people.

Chapter 7

7:1. Woe is me: The prophet is the mourner instead of the people. And thus it is the custom of the prophet to speak the words of the people instead of them, as (in 6:11), "Shall I acquit the man with wicked scales?" and (Qoh 2:15), "What befalls the fool will befall me also; why then have I been so very wise?" This should be associated with the words above; for when the people who are in the city hear the words of the great king who calls them on the appointed day for justice, they begin crying and⁹² mourning what should they do at the day of judgment, and who shall stand for them in the day of the anger of the Lord?

Woe is me: For I have no one to step into the breach and it is without protection. As when the summer fruit has been gathered: These are the late ripening fruits which are defective among the produce, because there is nothing left except the gathering of the summer fruit.

7:2. Thus: The godly man has perished from the land: For there is no one to step into the breach to turn his wrath from the destruction, and only evil men and sinners are left⁹³ among the people. Because they all lie in wait for blood: Human blood. With a net: A snare.

7:3. Their hands are upon what is evil, to do it diligently: As a man watches to do the evil of both hands well and correctly, for they rob and oppress them. The prince: Because it was his responsibility to do it well and correctly. Asks: For a bribe. And the judge: He also is partner to the payment, for he has no desire to do justice for the one robbed by the robber; only afterward will he divide with him payment from the plunder. The great man: He is a person of eminence, for it was his responsibility to

speak righteousness. Utters the evil desire of his soul: When the robbed one comes, between them they twist, make great, and strengthen the evil. Thus they weave it together: This is as (Exod 28:22),⁹⁴ "You shall make twisted chains like cords." Because when the prince, judge, and the great man strengthen the hand of the robber, it is a great evil and entanglement; and a triple cord is not easily cut (cf. Qoh 4:12).

7:4. The best of them: The best of the princes, judges, and great men. Like a brier: In a thicket hedge which sticks out. A thorn hedge: Because a man becomes entangled and enmeshed among them, and he is stuck and torn until he cannot get out of them, and so is the upright among them. And thus is its interpretation. The best of them are as briers and thus upright. Like which brier? Like a brier of a thorn hedge. And thus one could say, the best of them are straight like a brier of a thorn hedge, and thus is says (in Prov 15:19), "The way of the sluggard is overgrown with thorns, but the path of the upright is a level highway." The straight path is set opposite the thicket of thorns, thus also here the upright and the thorn [are set opposite each other]; and his neighbour denounces him.⁹⁵ The day of your watchmen: Because a man expects uprightness from their justice. Then your punishment has come: To render you guilty. Now: When the opinion is acquittal, then "their confusion is at hand" for you. And if you say thus, they are the judges and the princes, but they are really your neighbours and your brothers; and [if you say] the men of your deliverance will not betray you, this is not so because:

7:5. Put no trust in a neighbour, have no confidence in a friend: The one who was taught and reared with you from his youth. Also, from her who lies in your bosom: Your wife. Guard the doors

of your mouth: Do not reveal your advice and counsel.

7:6. Also, the son treats the father with contempt: He throws off his kindness and despises him; thus, such is the evil of this generation. And for whom do I watch? And do I long for the day of punishment? And who will defend me?

7:7. But as for me: Since there is no one who defends me in judgment. I will look to the Lord: Let me surrender myself to the hand of the Lord, for his mercies are great; but unto the hand of men I will not fall (cf. 2 Sam 24:14). And my assurance is that my God will hear me: He will deal with me with long-suffering and great loving kindness with justice and not according to my sins.⁹⁶

7:8. Rejoice not over me, O my enemy: These are the many peoples who are assembled against me⁹⁷ with Sennacherib who said, "Let her be profaned and let our eyes gaze upon Zion" (4:8). When I fall: For Sennacherib seized all the cities of Judah with fortified walls; he passed through and invaded it. I shall rise: For he returned shamefacedly to his own land, all his army fell dead. This is like "when I sit in darkness," then "the Lord will be a light to me," eventually (7:8).

7:9. I will bear the indignation of the Lord: And I shall suffer. Because I have sinned against him: For it is a remission of sin, and not for destruction. Until he pleads my cause and executes judgment for me: From Sennacherib.

7:10. Then my enemy will see: The one who said in her heart, "(Now) where is the Lord your God?"--the justice of God and his vengeance for he will avenge me. And shame will cover her: For she was expecting to gloat over me, but "my eyes will gloat over he." And this is not as it says (in 4:11), "Let our eyes

gaze upon Zion." Because now she will be trodden down: By me.

Like the mire of the streets: In the days of Hezekiah. As it is written (2 Kgs 18:8), "He smote the Philistines as far as Gaza and its territory, from watchtower to fortified city," and also (2 Chr 32:23), "So that he was exalted in the sight of all nations from that time onward."

7:11. A day for the building of your walls: For God shall build your walls which are cracked. In that day the boundary shall be far extended: Your enemies, because high rank and royalty will be cut off from them.

7:12. In that day for they will come to you: The foe and the enemy, and they shall be humbled before you. And which of them will be humbled by you and come unto you? From Assyria and all the fortified cities which belonged to it; such as Nineveh and the great city and her environs--Resen, Calah, and Rehoboth-ir (cf. Gen 10:8-12). And from the fortified cities unto the river:⁹⁸ The Euphrates.⁹⁹ And sea: Unto the sea. From sea: It is as if he said, "From sea to sea" (מֵיָם וְעַד יָם). It is similar to (Ps 72:8), "From sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth." And thus also (Exod 23:31), "And I will set your bounds from the Red Sea to the sea of the Philistines, and from the wilderness to the Euphrates." A mountain of the mountain:¹⁰⁰ The highest hills that are in the mountains. This is like "the holy of holies" (cf. e.g., Num 4:4, "The most holy").

7:13. And it will be: Their land. Will become desolate because of its inhabitants: Your enemies. For the fruit of their doings: Which they did to you. Because of this the prophet finds an opportunity to pray for them:

7:14. Shepherd thy people with thy staff: May you chastise

them, and instruct them in the way of goodness and uprightness. That they might dwell alone: In safety, "in a forest in the midst of a garden land." As in the days of old: Like in the days of David and Solomon.

7:15. I will show him marvelous things: There will be a highway for them in the sea and in the river for his feet to cross over as it is clear in Isaiah.¹⁰¹

7:16: They shall lay their hands on their mouths: For they do not answer Israel. And it is as if their ears shall be deaf: Before them, because they do not listen. This is like (Ps 38:14), "Yea, I am like a man who does not hear, and in whose mouth are no rebukes."

7:17. They shall lick the dust like a serpent: By prostrating themselves before Israel. As (in Isa 49:23), "With their faces to the ground they shall bow down to you, and lick the dust of your feet." And thus also it says (in Ps 72:9), "May they fear thee and bow down before him, and his enemies lick the dust." Because they shall fear and shut themselves off in their enclosures¹⁰² and their fortresses. From whom shall they fear? "They shall turn in dread to the Lord our God."

7:18. Pardoning iniquity: Who removes sin from before his eyes. And passing over transgression: As if he does not see it and does not wish to consider it. For the remnant of his inheritance: Those who remain from the exile of Sennacherib.

7:19. He will tread: "So that they may not be seen." Into the depths: As if they were in the depths so that they do not come to his attention.

7:20. Thou wilt show faithfulness: You will establish for Jacob the steadfast love of Abraham which "thou hast sworn

to our father" that steadfast love, and you will establish it for Jacob.

FOOTNOTES

INTRODUCTION

1. J. T. Willis, "Fundamental Issues in Contemporary Micah Studies," RestQ 13 (1970), pp. 77-90.
2. L. Allen, The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, and Micah, Grand Rapids, 1976; J. Mays, Micah, Philadelphia: 1976; W. Rudolph, Micha-Nahum-Habakuk-Zephaniah, Gütersloh: 1975; A. van der Woude, Micha, Nijkerk: 1976; R. Vuilleumier (and C. Keller), Micheé, Nahoum, Habacuc, and Sophonie, Paris: 1971.
3. Cf. K. Jeppesen, "New Aspects of Micah Research," JSOT 8 (1978), pp. 3-32.

CHAPTER 1. THE VERSIONS, DEAD SEA SCROLLS, NEW TESTAMENT, AND THE MASORETIC TEXT OF MICAH

1. Cf. O. Kaiser and W. Kummel, Exegetical Method, NY: 1963; "A Reliable, critically edited text in the original language forms the general basis of every scholarly pursuit connected with the Old Testament...the text to be explained must first be established" (pp. 11-12).
2. Roberts himself remarks, "By changing the traditional title, 'Textual Criticism' to 'Textual Transmission,' the editor has recognized the change of character that has taken place in the topic during the past few years," p. 1, Tradition and Interpretation, Oxford: 1980, pp. 1-30. Cf. also J. Sanders, "Text and Canon: Concepts and Method," JBL 98 (1979), pp. 5-29.
3. S. Talmon, "The Textual Study of the Bible--A New Outlook," Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text, Mass: 1975, pp. 321-400.
4. VTSup 29(1978), pp. 131-148.
5. Cognizance was also taken of the Ethiopic and Coptic texts based on the studies of H. Fuhs (Die Äthiopische Übersetzung des Propheten Micha, Bonn: 1968) and W. Grossouw (The Coptic Version of the Minor Prophets, Rome: 1938), but these added little to our understanding of the text and took us too far afield to form an integral part of our study.
6. M. Goshen-Gottstein, "Theory and Practice of Textual Criticism: The Text-Critical Use of the LXX," Textus 3 (1963), p. 132.

7. R. Tabor, "Translation as Interpretation," Int 32 (1978), p. 131.
8. Roberts states, "There is one major line of demarcation which should be mentioned at the outset, namely that those versions which derive from the Christian Church form a separate group from those with a synagogue background, because the whole story of the transmission is different" ("Transmission," p. 16).
9. Greenberg states, "But to recognize and stay within one's limitations is a sign of responsibility, and it is a call for responsibility in text-critical and exegetical work, for abandoning illusory goals in favor of the proper tasks that summon us, that my argument is advanced" (p. 148).
10. Cf. S. Jellicoe, The Septuagint and Modern Study, Oxford: 1968, pp. 47f.
11. H. St. J. Thackeray, "The Greek Translator of the Prophetical Books," JTS 4 (1903), p. 579.
12. S. Brock, "The Phenomenon of the Septuagint," OTS 17 (1972), p. 12.
13. E. Bickerman, "The Septuagint as a Translation," Studies in Jewish and Christian History, Leiden: 1976, pp. 167-200.
14. This may be, at least in part, attributable to the fact that the text of the Pentateuch, at the time of the translation, may not have been as fluid as the text of other books.
15. R. Meyer, "Michabuch," RGG₃, Vol 4, col. 930.
16. M. Collin, "Recherches sur L'Histoire Textuelle du Prophète Michée," VT 21 (1971), pp. 281-297.
17. J. Oberholzer, "Miga 1:10-16 en die Septuaginta," Hervormde Teologiese Studies, 1974, pp. 74-85.
18. E. Z. Melamed, "The Translation of the LXX to the Book of Micah" (Hebrew), Eshkolot 3 (1975), pp. 90-105.
19. Cf. J. Taylor, The Massoretic Text and the Ancient Versions of Micah, London: 1890, pp. 1-2.
20. Cf. S. Schwantes, A Critical Study of the Text of Micah, Unpublished PhD Thesis, Johns Hopkins University, 1962, p. 186.
21. Cf. M. Sebök, Die Syrische Übersetzung der Zwölf Kleinen Propheten, Breslau: 1887, p. 3.
22. Cf. J. Bloch, "The Authorship of the Peshitta," AJSL 35 (1918), pp. 215-22.
23. A. Gelston, editor, Vetus Testamentum Syriace, part III, fascicle 4, "Dodekapropheton-Daniel-Bel-Draco," Leiden: 1980. Gelston promises to deal with the question of origin, as well as the

characteristics of P and its relationship to the Hebrew and other ancient versions (p. xxxi).

24. A. Vööbus, "Syriac Versions," IDBSup, p. 849.
25. Cf. the Aramaic כִּנְשׁ , "to gather; collect" which the translator may have felt was more suitable than the Hebrew כָּבַשׁ . As Taylor notes, however, P does have כִּנְשׁ at Zech 9:15 for the Hebrew כָּבַשׁ (cf. also Jer. 34:16).
26. M. Klein, "Converse Translation: A Targumic Technique," Bib 67 (1967), pp. 515-537.
27. This interesting reference to the earth quaking upon the translation of the Prophets (and not the Pentateuch) is attributed by the Rabbis to the fact that the Pentateuch is expressed clearly but "the meaning of the Prophets is in some things expressed clearly and in other enigmatically" (Meg. 3a).
28. Cf. M. Simon, editor of The Megillah, BT Mo'ed VIII, London: 1938, p. 9, n. 6.
29. Cf. B. Grossfeld, "Targum," EncJud (NY: 1971), vol. 4, pp. 841-851; B. Roberts, Text; and "Old Testament: Manuscripts, Text, and Versions," CHB II, pp. 1-26; E. Wurthwein, The Text of the Old Testament, Grand Rapids: 1979, pp. 75-79.
30. P. Churgin, Targum Jonathan to the Prophets, New Haven: 1907, p. 22.
31. J. Gribomont, IDBSup, p. 530.
32. Cf. J. Barr, "St Jerome's Appreciation of Hebrew," BJRL 49 (1966-67), pp. 37-51.
33. In this initial investigation there was found no word or phrase where one may state unequivocally that the Vorlage of V differs from the consonantal text of the MT. Possibilities exist, but factors such as influence from the LXX or other translations, normal scribal confusions (dittography, haplography, etc.), or renderings ad sensum may account for these divergencies. Different vocalizations from the MT occur (e.g., emissarios at 1:14 for שְׁלוּחִים), as we should expect, but the consonantal text seems to have been established by Jerome's time.
34. Cf. H. Redpath, "The Geography of the Septuagint," AJT 7 (1903), pp. 289-307; I. L. Seeligman, The Septuagint Version of Isaiah. (Leiden: 1948, pp. 77-81).
35. For example, in Isaiah Samaria is usually rendered Σαμαρεία , whereas at Isa 7:9 it is rendered Σομρον .
36. For example, Bashan, usually rendered Βασαν is rendered as Γαλιλαία at Isa 33:9.
37. S. Talmon, "The Old Testament Text," CHB 1, p. 182.
38. J. Milik, Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea, London: 1959, p. 27.

39. M. Horgan, Pesharim: Qumran Interpretation of Biblical, Fordham University: 1977, p. 2.
40. G. Vermes, "Interpretation, History of: Qumran and the Targums," IDBSup, p. 439.
41. F. F. Bruce, Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Grand Rapids: 1972, p. 70.
42. G. Vermes, "The Qumran Interpretation of Scripture in Its Historical Setting," ALUOS 6 (1966-68), pp. 91-92.
43. Cf. Ezek 34:14; "I will feed them with good pasture, and upon the mountain heights (וּבְהָרֵי רְמוֹם) of Israel shall be their good pasture."
44. D. Barthélemy, Les Dévanciers d'Aquila (VTSup 10), Leiden: 1963.
45. Cf. J. Pelikan, Chr Trad, vol 1, Chicago: 1971, p. 14, "This struggle over the authority of the Old Testament and over the nature of the continuity between Judaism and Christianity was the earliest form of the quest for a tradition that has, in other forms, recurred throughout Christian history."
46. Cf. e.g., R. Longenecker, Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period, Grand Rapids: 1975, pp. 11-15; and D. Hay, "Interpretation, History of: NT Interpretation of the OT," IDBSup, pp. 443-46.
47. Cf. Pelikan, "The earliest Christians were Jews, and in their new faith they found a continuity with the old" (vol. 1, p. 15). Longenecker makes essentially the same point when he says that only the Johanne epistles lack explicit and frequent use of OT quotations (p. 210). Cf. also C. Barrett, "The Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New," CHB 1, pp. 403, 405, 410.
48. Cf. R. Gundry, The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel, Leiden: 1967, pp. 3-5.
49. Cf. E. Richard, "The Creative Use of Amos by the Author of Acts," NTS 24 (1982), pp. 37-38.
50. The words "land of Judah" may also represent a contemporizing of the term "Ephrathah"; cf. R. Gundry, Use, p. 91, where he cites evidence from the LXX (Cf. I. L. Seeligmann, The Septuagint Version of Isaiah, Leiden: 1948, pp. 77ff.), and notes the tendency of poetical passages to have archaic language. Cf. also P. Gaechter, Das Matthäus-Evangelium, Innsbruck: 1964, who says it is "Geographisches modernisiert" (p. 63), and W. Grundmann, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus, Berlin: 1973, who comments, "er ersetzt das ungeläufige ephrata durch γῆ 'Ιουδα" (p. 78).
51. Cf. R. Gundry, Matthew, Grand Rapids: 1982, p. 29; G. Soares-Prabhu, The Formula Quotations in the Infancy Narrative of Matthew, Rome: 1976, pp. 262-63; R. Brown, The Birth of the Messiah, Garden City: 1977, p. 184. Gundry further argues that "land of Judah" testifies to Matt's "typically Jewish land-consciousness" (Commentary, p. 29).

52. Cf. also E. Lohmeyer, Das Evangelium des Matthäus (ed. W. Schmauch), Göttingen: 1967, p. 23.
53. V, parvulus es, and P, זענריא אנה , follow neither the LXX nor Tg, but stand closer to the MT.
54. Soares-Prabhu rejects the idea that Bethlehem was insignificant on the basis of such texts as I Sam 20:61; I Chr 2:51; and Ezra 2:21; he says, "It could not, then, be described as 'too little to be among the clans of Judah'" (p. 264). However, cf. pp. 155ff. for the exegesis of צעיר להיוה.
55. The LXX employs ἡγέμων for הילא mostly in Gen and Chr, but never in the prophets. In Jer ἡγέμων translates שר .
56. The entire phrase in the LXX of 2 Sam 5:2 is καὶ σύ ἔσει ἡγούμενον ἐπὶ τὸν λαὸν μου Ἰσραήλ.
57. Gundry argues that this term shows the superiority of Jesus over Pilate who is designated ἡγεμῶν by Matt but not by the other Evangelists (Commentary, p. 29).
58. P also omits לי but since P is not influenced by Matt in any other respect, it would seem that it is not influenced on this minor point. The omission by P may simply be due to the general difficulty of translating לי in the clause.
59. The LXX of 2 Sam 5:2 is a literal translation of the MT.
60. C. Barrett, The Gospel According to St. John, Philadelphia: 1978, p. 230. Cf. also J. Bernard, St. John, 2 vols. Edinburgh: 1928, p. 286. R. Brown, The Gospel According to John, Garden City: 1971, supports this but acknowledges that other interpretations of John's silence are possible (p. 330). Cf. also G. Reim, Studien Zum Alttestamentlichen Hintergrund des Johannesevangeliums (Cambridge: 1974), who says, "Mi 5:1 aus Bethlehem erwartete, geht aus dem TG hervor und aus den Schriftbeweisen von Christen, die auf Angriffe ähnlicher Art, wie Wir sie in Joh 7,42 finden, geantwortet haben dass Jesus in Bethlehem geboren ist" (pp. 20-21).
61. But cf. A Plummer, Edinburgh: 1900. I. Marshall, The Gospel of Luke, Grand Rapids: 1978, says, "Thus the attentive reader is prepared for the birth of a child to a descendent of David in the city of David" (p. 105).
62. Matt 23:14 is not found in the earliest mss. and appears to be a later insertion on the analogy of Mark 12:40 and Luke 20:47.
63. Cf. the similarities between "rue," שברא , and "dill," שבוא .
64. Gundry says that βαρύτερα and νομοῦ belong to Matt's special vocabulary (Commentary, p. 463). Cf. the irony of these words when contrasted with Matt 23:4.
65. Cf. Matt 2:6; tradition held that Jesus was born in Bethlehem (Luke 2:4), but Matt grounds this tradition in an OT promise-fulfillment motif based on Mic 5:1.

66. It is worth noting that Marcion omits this in Luke's text.
67. Luke's phrase is a less common synonym for the phrase in the LXX; cf. Marshall, p. 85.
68. Plummer says, "The eternity of Christ's kingdom is assured by the fact that it is to be absorbed in the kingdom of the Father" (p. 23).
69. In speaking of Luke 1:33, Marshall states, "The early church clearly associated the reign of Jesus with his resurrection and exaltation and linked this with the Davidic promises (Acts 2: 30-36)" (p. 68).
70. Cf. C. Cranfield, Romans, 2 vols, Edinburgh: 1975.
71. Tg inserts the oath at Bethel, the covenant with Abraham between the "pieces," and the binding of Isaac before God in its paraphrase of the promises to "our Fathers."
72. R. Bultmann, The Gospel of John, Philadelphia: 1971.
73. No textual or exegetical dependence on the versions can be shown; both the LXX and Tg are literal translations of the Hebrew. However, John translates הקצור by θερλζω whereas the LXX has ἀμῶν ; both are common translations of קצר.
74. The theme that in the person and work of Jesus an overturning of the old order and the inauguration of a new order has begun is prevalent in the Gospels and early Christianity; cf. Phil 2:5-11. Westcott (The Gospel According to St. John, reprint, Grand Rapids: 1951) finds in John 4:37 a lesson to prepare the disciples for future disappointment (thus establishing a continuity with the OT idea of judgment), but the proverb comes as a rebuke to the disciples, not because they were rejoicing and needed a reminder that their present success might be followed by future disappointment, rather, because the disciples were more concerned with the "physical harvest" (4:31-35) and were not rejoicing nor reaping the "spiritual harvest" which had already begun (4:36-38). A parallel rebuke in the Synoptics concerning the radical difference that the new order brings occurs at Matt 20:20-28. Cf. also Bernard, "The proverb is not only accurate, if cynical in regard to the physical harvest; but the highest illustration of its truth is seen in the spiritual region" (p. 159).
75. Allen argues that the language employed is the typical reaction to "bad news": cf. Exod 15:14-16; Ps 48:5f.; Isa 13:7f., passim. Cf. also D. Hillars, "A Convention in Hebrew Literature: The Reaction to Bad News," ZAW 77 (1965), pp. 86-90.
76. Cf. also Brown, John, "In harmony with the symbolism wherein the combined death and resurrection of Jesus is represented by the messianic birth of a child, John sees the disciples' suffering at the death of Jesus as thlipsis which precedes the emergence of the definitive divine dispensation" (p. 733).
77. Bernard, in commenting on the joy in John 16:21 against the lack of joy in passages of childbirth imagery in the OT, says, "But

the thought of joy which follows the pain does not occur except here" (p. 515). Joy may not be as far removed from the OT passages as Bernard things; even the Medieval Jewish exegete Eliezer in his comments on Mic 5:2 makes the connection between birth and joy.

78. Cf. Bultmann, "It is not however as if the promise simply meant that χάρα will follow λύπη after an interval of time; on the contrary χάρα had its origin in λύπη " (p. 579).
79. Cf. R. Mounce, The Book of Revelation, Grand Rapids: 1977; H. Swete, Commentary on Revelation, reprint Michigan: 1977; Caird, The Revelation of St. John the Divine, N.Y.: 1966.
80. Cf. M. Barth, Ephesians, 2 vols., Garden City: 1974; H. Schlier, Der Brief an die Epheser, Düsseldorf: 1957.
81. Gundry (Use, pp. 205ff.) picks up the idea of textplots from C. H. Dodd (According to the Scriptures, London: 1952) who argues that the mainstream of quotations in the NT relates to Jesus and the Church and stems from the NT authors exploiting whole contexts of OT material rather than isolated proof-texts. Gundry's study extends the number of texts to include Mic 4-5, and 7 among others (cf. Use, pp. 206ff).
82. K. Stendahl, The School of St. Matthew and Its Use of the Old Testament, Philadelphia: 1954, p. 166.
83. Luke's text being the most primitive is therefore mitigated by this. Whichever text one views as the most original, it is difficult to account for the relationship or influences of all three texts.
84. A. Baumstark, "Die Zitate des Mt-Evangeliums aus dem Zwölfprophetenbuch," Bib 37 (1956), pp. 296-313.
85. Cf. Gundry, Use, pp. 205 ff. and footnote 81 above.
86. Cf. Yalkut Shimoni on Mic 6:8.
87. Cf. H. McKeating, Amos, Hosea, and Micah, Cambridge: 1971, p. 186.
88. Cf. Gundry's remarks on Matt: "It is established, then, that in common with the other NT writers Matt does not deal atomistically with the OT in the sense that he does not search either haphazardly or systematically for isolated proof-texts, but in the main confines himself to areas of the OT which the church recognized as having special bearing upon the ministry of Jesus Christ, upon the new dispensation inaugurated by him, and upon his expected return and the events connected with it" (Use, p. 208). This agrees with Longenecker's conclusion concerning the NT as a whole (pp. 205-220). E. Ellis comes to the same conclusion in his study of Pauline texts; "Their [i.e., the rabbis] splinterised, purposeless, speculative musings which 'suspend dogmatic mountains on textual hairs' have not the remotest kinship with Paul's theology or hermeneutical

principles" (Paul's Use of the Old Testament, Reprint, Grand Rapids; 1981, p. 75).

89. Cf. S. Brock, "Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity," Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies 20 (1979), pp. 69-87.
90. We are speaking of relative competence when we use "competence" in this section. Although the translators were bi- or trilingual, their degree of competence, especially in Hebrew, is relative to their exposure and use of the language. Since this varies from region to region, or from time to time, the degree of competence also varies. With respect to the LXX, his literalism, and especially the manner of his literalism, is indicative of his lack of competence (e.g., his rendering of the root נלש in 2:8; 5:5; and 7:3; or cf. 1:1).
91. The Hebrew text comes to the forefront once again in the later controversies between Jews and Christians.

CHAPTER 2. THE SURVEY OF THE HISTORY OF INTERPRETATION OF MICAH 4:14-5:5

1. R. P. Carroll rightly observes that a proper history of interpretation should include not only commentaries but also novels, poetry, and perhaps even art, music, and cinema ("Childs and Canon," IBS [Oct 1980], pp. 211-236). He also recognizes the practical problems involved in this; "The task is endless and quickly conforms to the law of diminishing returns" (p. 228).
2. Cf. E. Osborn, "Methods and Problems in Patristic Study," USQR 26 (1980), pp. 45-54; G. Bromiley, Historical Theology. Grand Rapids: 1978, pp. xxi-xxvi; and J. Pelikan, Chr Trad, vol. 1, pp. 1-10.
3. Cf. F. Farrar's History of Interpretation. London: 1886. His condescending attitude towards most of the history of exegesis mars this otherwise invaluable and influential work.
4. B. Childs, "The Sensus Literalis of Scripture: An Ancient and Modern Problem," Beitrage Zur Alttestamentlichen Theologie. Göttingen: 1977, p. 80.
5. R. Loewe, "The 'Plain' Meaning of Scripture in Early Jewish Exegesis," Papers of the Institute of Jewish Studies (1964), p. 176. Cf. also J. Preuss, From Shadow to Promise. Massachusetts: 1969, who comes to similar conclusions in his examination of early Christian exegesis.
6. J. Alexander, "The Interpretation of Scripture in the Ante-Nicene Period," Int 12 (1958), p. 280.
7. M. Wiles, "Theodore of Mopsuestia as Representative of the Antiochene School," CHB 1, p. 489.

8. R. Grant, A Short History of the Interpretation of Scripture, NY: 1963, p. 76.
9. H. Bate, "Some Technical Terms of Greek Exegesis," JTS 24 (1922-23), p. 62.
10. K. Grobel, "Interpretation, History, and Principles of," IDB, vol 2, pp. 718-724.
11. Cf. Wiles: "Antiochene scholarship in general is a subject in which the lure of anachronistic judgements is an ever-present danger. It has many features which do have a genuinely modern ring about them, and it is easy to fall into the error of treating the Antiochenes as nineteenth- or twentieth-century critical historians with a number of surprising aberrations. But such an approach destroys the possibility of any true assessment of them" (pp. 490-491).
12. Cf. R. Loewe: "In other words, christological exegesis acted as a challenge to the Synagogue to prove by its own that it was in no sense spiritually poorer than the Church for its rejection of the Incarnation..." ("The Jewish Midrashim and Patristic and Scholastic Exegesis of the Bible," Studia Patristica 1, p. 497).
13. Cf. R. Wilken and W. Meeks, Jews and Christians in Antioch in the First Four Centuries of the Common Era. Montana: 1978, p. 27.
14. Cf. R. Wilken, "Judaism in Roman Christian Society," JR 47 (1967), pp. 313-330.
15. R. Wilken, Judaism and the Early Christian Mind. New Haven: 1971, p. x.
16. Cf. J. Kelly, Jerome. London: 1975, p. 163.
17. Cf. H. Sprenger, Theodori Mopsuesteni Commentarius in XII Prophetas. Weisbaden: 1977, p. 55.
18. Cf. A. Kerrigan, St. Cyril of Alexandria. Rome, 1952, p. 86. "The examples reviewed in the preceding pages demonstrate that St. Cyril not only discovers figurative language in Sacred Scripture but also attaches at times to the literal sense."
19. G. Ashby, Theodoret of Cyrrhus as Exegete of the Old Testament. South Africa: 1972, pp. 13-16.
20. Cf. J. Barr, "St. Jerome's Appreciation of Hebrew," BJRL 49 (1966-67), pp. 37-51.
21. B. Smalley, The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages. Notre Dame: 1964, p. xi.
22. Cf. A. Grabois, "The Hebraica Veritas and Jewish-Christian Intellectual Relations in the Twelfth Century" Speculum 50 (1975), pp. 613-634.

23. Cf. H. Dressler, "Haimo of Auxerre," New Catholic Encyclopedia, vol. 6, pp. 898-99. Contrast, Distal, Geschichte des Alten Testaments in der Christlichen Kirche. Jena: 1860, p. 166, and Lexikon fur Theologie und Kirche, Band 4. Briesgan: 1960.
24. E. Rosenthal, "Medieval Jewish Exegesis: Its Character and Significance," JSS 9 (1964), p. 265.
25. E. Rosenthal, "The Study of the Bible in Medieval Judaism," Studia Semitica, vol. 1, Cambridge: 1971, p. 256.
26. E. Rosenthal, "Anti-Christian Polemics in Medieval Bible Commentaries," Studia Semitica, vol. 1, Cambridge: 1971, p. 184.
27. Or, "from the days of the world (מלכת)."
28. This does not, of course, signify the pre-existence of the Messiah, only the pre-existence of his name. In rabbinic thought the name of the Messiah, the Torah, repentance, Paradise, Hell, the throne of God and the Temple were created before the world (cf. Peshah 54a).
29. The Yalkut includes a sentence not in the Talmud (without designating the source) which says that Isaac is established near-by, standing at the "Valley Of Gehenna" to save his sons from future judgment.
30. The Talmud mentions the Messiah before Elijah but cf. Mal 3:23 (4:5), "Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the great and terrible day of the Lord comes."
31. Cf. B. Gelles, Peshat and Derash in Rashi's Commentary of the Bible, Ph.D. Thesis, London, "It emerges therefore that Rashi's concept of peshat lacks a basic ingredient of rational exegesis, i.e., the claim to an exclusive meaning of the text of Scripture," p. 107.
32. R. Bainton, "The Bible in the Reformation," CHB III, p. 1.
33. E. Kraeling, The Old Testament Since the Reformation. New York: 1955, pp. 12f.
34. F. Crehan, "The Bible in the Roman Catholic Church from Trent to the Present Day," CHB III, pp. 222-237.
35. J. Pelikan, Luther the Expositor. St. Louis: 1959, p. 38.
36. B. Hall, "Biblical Scholarship: Editions and Commentaries," CHB III, p. 88.
37. H. Frei, The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative. New Haven: 1974, p. 5.

38. W. Neil, "The Criticism and Theological Use of the Bible, 1700-1950," CHB III, p. 238, quoting L. Stephen, English Thought in the Eighteenth Century.

CHAPTER 3. THE EXEGESIS OF MICAH 4:14-5:5

1. B. Renaud, Structure et Attaches Littéraires de Michée IV-V. Paris: 1964.
2. B. Stade, "Bemerkungen über das Buch Micha," ZAW 1 (1881), pp. 161-172; cf. also ZAW 3 (1883), 4 (1884), 6 (1886), 23 (1903).
3. Cf. K. Jeppesen, "How the Book of Micah Lost Its Integrity," ST 33 (1979), pp. 121-131.
4. Note also the use of גִּדְּלָא in 2 Sam 22:30 as a parallel term to שוּר , "wall." RSV translates this as "Yea by thee I can crush a troop, and by my God I can leap over a wall." Holliday, however, cites גִּדְּלָא in 2 Sam 22:30 as meaning "wall."
5. J. T. Willis, "Micah 4:14-5:5; A Unit," VT 18, pp. 529-547.
6. The proposal of T. K. Cheyne ("Micah," Critica Biblica, Amsterdam: 1970, pp. 153-163) that גִּדְּלָא is a corruption of "Gilead" and גִּדְּלָא should be emended to גִּלְגָּלִי , whereby he reconstructs the verse (on the analogy of Ps 3:8) to read, "Now stir thyself, O people of Gilead at Zarphath they shall smite the raiders of Ismael on the cheek," has little to commend and scholarship has been right to ignore it.
7. In a private communication, Professor W. McKane said that he favours this interpretation of Jer 5:7, though he reads the sin of וַאֲשַׁבַּע as a shin, "When I put them under oath."
8. Perhaps also germane to Jer 5:7 is the combination of sexual licentiousness and physical brutality that characterizes certain goddesses of antiquity. M. Pope says, "The combination of beauty and terror which distinguishes the Lady of the Canticle also characterizes the goddess of Love and War throughout the ancient world . . . The goddess Anat of the Ugaritic myths is elsewhere in the myths distinguished for her violence, but she is also the ideal of feminine beauty" (p. 562, Song of Songs, New York: 1977).
9. The verse division of the MT suggests that they also understood this verse to follow from 4:13, perhaps under the influence of Tg's translation. The verse division in the Christian tradition seems to follow from Jerome and V.
10. Cf. T. Collins, Line Forms in Hebrew Poetry. Rome: 1978, pp. 42f., and J. Kugel, The Idea of Biblical Poetry. New Haven: 1981, pp. 15ff.

11. Cf. W. Chomsky, "The Ambiguity of the Prefixed Prepositions נִלְכַּח in the Bible," JQR 61 (1970-71), pp. 87-89.
12. We may even carry this one step further. If נִלְכַּח were originally part of the text, and read as a rhetorical question which required a negative answer, this may account for the negative reading in the Lucianic text and perhaps in Matt 2:6 (cf. eg. Tg and P turning the rhetorical question in Mic 7:18 into a negative statement).
13. Cf. also Allen, "Small in respect of being among Judah's clans" and T. Lescow, "Das Begurtsmotiv in den Messianischen Weissagungen bei Jesaja und Micha," ZAW 79 (1967), pp. 172-207.
14. Matt 2:6 also omits נִלְכַּח but it is doubtful that this has influenced P in so insignificant a matter (cf. p. 56).
15. J. Fitzmyer, " נִלְכַּח as a Preposition and a Particle in Micah 5:1 (5:2)," CBQ 18 (1956), pp. 10-13.
16. He also cites two articles each by W. Albright, Basor 82, p. 49; CBQ 7, pp. 24-5; and Eitan, AJSL 45, pp. 202f., REJ 74, pp. 15-6.
17. T. Muraoka, "On the So-called Dativus Ethicus in Hebrew," JTS 29 (1978), pp. 495-498, argues that it is ill-advised to apply the ethical dative to Biblical Hebrew. He argues, "The preposition לָמַדְהוּ followed by the matching pronominal suffix seems to have the effect of creating a self-contained little cosmos around the subject . . . an effect of focusing on the subject" (p. 497). This, however, does not affect our argument that the MT need not be emended.
18. J. Barr, Biblical Words for Time. London: 1962.
19. G. von Rad, Old Testament Theology, vol. II. New York: 1965, p. 170.
20. Cf. R. Clements, Isaiah 1-39, Grand Rapids: 1980; H. Wildberger, Jesaja 1-12, Neukirchen-Vluyn: 1965-72; W. McKane, "The Interpretation of Isaiah vii, 14-25," VT 17 (1967), pp. 208-219.
21. The form נִלְכַּח occurs only here and Amos 9:14 without athnach or soph pasuq (cf. Isa 65:21).
22. J. M. Allegro, "Uses of the Semitic Demonstrative Element ז in Hebrew," VT 5 (1955), pp. 309-313.
23. Kugel criticizes Lowth's classification of Hebrew parallelism in three broad types; "This classification, far from illuminating, simply obscured the potential subtleties of the form: everything now fell into one of three boxes" (p. 12, italics added).
24. W. Roth, "The Numerical Sequence $x/x + 1$ in the OT," VT 12 (1962), pp. 300-311.

CHAPTER 4. ELIEZER OF BEAUGENCY

1. The ms., housed at the Bodleian Library, Oxford, is listed as MS Opp. 625.
2. Our principal source of information concerning Eliezer is found in S. Poznanski's masterful study, Eliezer aus Beaugency, Kommentar zu Ezechiel und den XII Kleinen Propheten, Warsaw, 1910, 2 vols. Note should also be made of Commentaries on the Later Prophets by R. Eleazer of Beaugency. I. Isaiah, edited by J. W. Nutt (London: 1879). Cf. also S. A. Horodezky, "Eliezer Aus Beaugency," Cols. 459-60, Enc Jud, Band 6 (Berlin: 1930) and A. Grossman, "Eliezer of Beaugency," Cols. 630-31, Enc Jud, vol 6 (New York: 1971).
3. Cf. J. Reiner, "The English Yosippon," JQR 58 (1967/68), pp. 126-142; J. ben Goren, "Sefer Yosippon," The Jewish Encyclopedia, vo. 7 (New York: 1904ff.).
4. For Rashbam cf. R. B. Salters, The Book of Ecclesiastes: Text Versions and History of Exegesis, Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of St. Andrews: 1973.
5. Cf. S. Esh, "Variant Readings in Medieval Hebrew Commentaries," Textus V (Jerusalem: 1966), pp. 84-92; and R. B. Salters, "Possible Variant Readings in a Medieval Hebrew Commentary," JJS 30 (1979), pp. 85-90.
6. The translator(s) of the Targum did not connect המרשתה in vs. 1 with Moresheth-Gath (1:14), but with Mareshah (1:15). Early commentators are divided on the reference of the appellation. Rashi and Luther follow the Targum, but Jerome connects it with Moresheth-Gath: Porro quod supra urbem prophetarum המרשתה haereditatem interpretati sumus: sciat lector in eodem versiculo quem posuimus: propterea dabit emissarios super haereditatem Geth: in Hebraeo pro haereditate Geth: מורשתה גת positum.
7. RSV reads, "High places of the land."
8. RSV reads, "What is the sin of the house of Judah?" following the LXX.
9. Cf. 1:3; Eliezer understands both במנהי and במנה as a reference to people and not to places (cf. IQpMic 1:5).
10. Literally, "For a cleaning of sweepings of a field." The sense appears to be the refuse that was collected from one field and dumped elsewhere. Poznanski says that according to the knowledge of Eliezer, לעי was the place where these "sweepings" were put. Thus Samaria would be made a dumping ground and no one would live in her.
11. RSV reads, "I will go stripped and naked."
12. אֶשְׁתּוֹרְדִּי, Poznanski transliterates this as éstordiz which is equivalent to étourdi. The verb étourdir means "to be dazed"; the adjective means "scatter-brained, thoughtless."

13. RSV reads, "In Beth-le-aphrah."
14. RSV margin reads, "Who gives beautiful words."
15. The edited text has גלוי , but the ms. reads גילוי as earlier in the comments.
16. The ms. specifically points the words, גלה וגילה קשור.
17. The ms. has a break here, whereas the edited text does not.
18. Poznanski says that the language is unclear and that Eliezer is not taking האצל as a noun. In the ms. the words ביוני and האצלי are superscriptions to the text and perhaps best left untranslated as attempts to gloss the text. A certain amount of freedom is required to render the text into English without redundancy.
19. The edited text has "Israel," but the ms. reads "Judah."
20. שון אשקל ; Poznanski transliterates this as son estal which equals son étal, "his stall." The usual meaning is a butcher's stall but it can also be extended to mean laying out one's goods. In this context it could thus mean "his support," that is, the staples he sells to them.
21. The printed text does not have a pause at this point, but the ms. does; the pause yields a smoother sense.
22. אדאמנדיר ; Poznanski transliterates this as a deamender, which equals admender (or amender), "to make reparation; to repair, compensate."
23. אשטליץ ; Poznanski transliterates this as atteléz, from atteler, "to harness, yoke."
24. The printed text has הוא but the ms. clearly reads היא , as does the MT.
25. Perhaps Eliezer understands שלוחים to mean dowry and not dismissal in this passage. Childs says that some commentators have understood it this way: the mekilta takes it to mean divorce (cf. B. Childs, Exodus. Phil: 1974).
26. The printed text has אכזב but the ms. reads אכזיב , as also the MT.
27. פליינצא ; which Poznanski transliterates as faillance, "failure."
28. The MT reads היות היה whereas Eliezer has quoted it as היה והיה.
29. The printed text has שבואו but the ms. reads שבואוה.
30. There is a break in the ms. after הצד , whereas Poznanski runs the sentences together.
31. The printed text has קל"ג ה' (133:5), but it should read ק"ג ה' (103:5).

32. As Poznanski says, the ms. reads ופעלי און ; but the MT reads הוי חשבי און ופעלי רע.
33. The printed text has 2 Sam 10:22, but 2 Sam 6:22 reads ונקלני עוד.
34. The gal and niph'al of these forms are both passive. For קלה ~see 2 Sam 6:22 and Job 40:4. For בזה see 1 Sam 15:9 and Gen 25:34. For הפך see Esth 9:1 and Jer 31:13. But note that the form in the MT of Mic 2:4 is pi'el.
35. The text of Jeremiah reads מהר אל-גבעה הלכי שובבים הרים rather than מהר אל גבעה שובבים.
36. The ms. specifically points לנביאִי.
37. RSV margin reads, "Yesterday."
38. RSV, "with a grievous destruction."
39. דשנצינייר ; which Poznanski transliterates as deraciner, "to uproot; tear up by the roots."
40. The ms. reads שאילן with לו written above it.
41. The printed text has קבצתים whereas the ms. reads קבצתם.
42. הדברו is not in the ms. and probably not necessary, since there is no stop in the text after "in the midst."
43. RSV, "a noisy multitude," cf. BDB, "murmur; shew disquietude."
44. The same phrase is repeated in the following line of the ms., an obvious dittography.
45. The printed text divides the line after מוטב whereas the ms. divides it after "Jacob."
46. The ms. specifically vocalizes it as פיצחו
47. Poznanski says that the ms. reads ידוניירנט which he corrects to רוניירנט. In fact, the ms. reads רדיניירנט. Poznanski is no doubt correct to render this as rongerent from ronger, "to gnaw, nibble."
48. The printed text has לבנם whereas the ms. reads לבם.
49. The ms. has the pl. in this line but the sg. in the following line.
50. The printed text has ואפילה , whereas the ms. reads וואפלה.
51. The MT reads אולם not אבל.
52. Probably a reference to the Temple mount.
53. אדרצקיר ; Poznanski transliterates this as adrézé, which equals dressé, "to set up, prepare."

54. Eliezer substitutes אליו for עליו (cf. Isa 2:3).
55. The printed text has שבתחו whereas the ms. reads שביטחו.
56. RSV, "They shall flow."
57. The reference should read Gen 46:31, not 36:41.
58. This phrase is not in the ms. and probably not necessary.
59. The printed text has מ"א but should read מ"ב.
60. The printed text has וההי but the ms. reads וההיו.
61. Or, "All the more certainly this is so since...." Eliezer is utilizing the interpretive principle "from minor to major" to indicate how much more this will apply in the exile.
62. RSV, "Now you are walled about," following LXX.
63. RSV, "With a wall," following LXX.
64. The printed text has הוא , whereas the ms. reads היא.
65. The printed text has שבא להיו , whereas the ms. reads בא להיו.
66. The ms. does not have על.
67. The printed text has יהיה whereas the ms. reads יהיו.
68. "Judah" is not in the ms. There does not appear to be a break after יצא in the ms., but it may read smoother if there is one. Alternatively, the text asks, "From whom will he go forth from Bethlehem?" then answers with, "His origins [are] from the ancients...."
69. As Poznanski notes, the ms. reads בעצמו עמו ; would seem most natural in the context and is used throughout the section.
70. The printed text has the pl. איוביהם where the ms. has the sg. איובהם.
71. RSV, "They shall dwell secure."
72. The ms. has a stop at this point, whereas the printed text does not.
73. The ms. reads כאגדה not באגדה.
74. RSV, "They shall rule."
75. RSV, "They shall deliver."
76. The ms. reads ואיו נגד כנף ופוצה פה but omits ומצפץ which Poznanski has inserted.
77. Cf. Tg.

78. As Poznanski observes, Eliezer seems to be taking אלים in the sense of אלה , "oak; terebinth tree," or איל , "mighty tree."
79. RSV, "He has showed you, O man, what is good." Eliezer is taking אדם as the subject rather than a vocative.
80. The ms. reads שרטר"א which Poznanski has emended to read simplicite. In his note on this, Poznanski says that the French term in the ms. makes no sense and that what is required is a term that denotes simplicity or modesty.
81. The printed text has צדקה whereas the mss reads צדק.
82. Eliezer evidently is taking יראה to be from ראה and not from ירא.
83. The ms. has הארץ whereas the MT reads הגוים.
84. The ms. has היש whereas the MT reads האש.
85. RSV, "Can I forget the treasures of wickedness in the house of the wicked."
86. RSV, "Therefore I have begun to smite you, making you desolate because of your sins."
87. Cf. NEB, "I stayed among them, dumbfounded."
88. The ms. repeats ויסאג והמה האוכל from the previous line; Poznanski omits this obvious dittography, but fails to note it.
89. דבטמנט ; Poznanski transliterates this as debatement, which is equivalent to abattement, "prostration; to be low-spirited."
90. RSV, "But not save." Eliezer is taking פלא in the active sense of the gal, rather than the passive sense of the pi'el or hiph'il, "to bring to safety." This also explains his comments in the previous line on ונאסג .
91. The printed text has יאכלוהו whereas the ms. reads יאכלוהו.
92. The ms. does not have the conjunction before "mourning" but the text reads smoother if one is present.
93. The printed text has the sg. נשאר whereas the ms. has the pl. נשארו.
94. The printed text should read Exod 28:22 and not Exod 28:24.
95. ויגיד עליו ריעו is an odd construction and seems out of place here; perhaps this anticipates vs 5, "Put no trust in a neighbour."
96. The ms. specifically points this as a pl.
97. Poznanski emends the text to ועלו and cites the ms. as reading עלו . In fact, the ms. clearly reads עלי and with the quotation of 4:11, the 1st sg. is appropriate. Also, Poznanski

cites the ms. as reading האומר in the next line. Again, the ms. actually reads האומר and thus there is no need to call for emendation or correction.

98. RSV, "And from Egypt to the River."
99. Contrary to Poznanski's note, the ms. clearly reads פרט and not פרט.
100. RSV, "From mountain to mountain."
101. Isa 11:16, "And there will be a highway from Assyria for the remnant which is left of his people, as there was for Israel when they came up from the land of Egypt."
102. The ms. reads the sg. in the first word but the pl. in the second.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Commentaries.

- Abbott, T. K. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians. Edinburgh: 1897.
- Allen, L. C. The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, and Micah. Grand Rapids: 1976.
- Allen, W. C. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According To St. Matthew. Edinburgh: 1912.
- Barrett, C. K. The Gospel According to St. John (2nd Edition). Philadelphia: 1978.
- Barth, M. Ephesians, 2 vols. Garden City: 1974.
- Bernard, J. H. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John, 2 vols. Edinburgh: 1928.
- Bonnard, P. L'Evangile Selon Saint Matthieu (2nd Edition). Neuchatel: 1970.
- Brown, R. E. The Gospel According to John, 2 vols. Garden City: 1971.
- Bright, J. Jeremiah. Garden City: 1965.
- Bultmann, R. The Gospel of John. Philadelphia: 1971.
- Calmet, A. Commentaire Literal Sur Tous Les Livres de L'Ancien et du Nouveau Testament, vol. 17. Paris: 1819.
- Calvin, J. Commentaries on the Twelve Minor Prophets, vol. 2. Grand Rapids: 1979 (Reprint).
- Charles, R. H. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John, 2 vols. Edinburgh: 1920.
- Clements, R. E. Isaiah 1-39. London/Grand Rapids: 1980.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, 2 vols. Edinburgh: 1975-1979.
- _____. The Gospel According to St. Mark. Cambridge: 1959.
- Cyril of Alexandria. Commentarius in Michaeam Prophetam. MPG, vol. 71.
- Eliezer of Beaugency. Kommentar zu Ezechiel und den XII Kleinen Propheten, 2 vols. (edited by S. Poznanski). Berlin: 1910.
- Gaechter, P. Das Matthäus Evangelium. Innsbruck: 1963.

- Grundmann, W. Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (3rd Edition). Berlin: 1972.
- Haimo v. Auxerre. Enarratio in Michaeam Prophetam. MPL, vol. 117.
- Isho'dad de Merv. Commentaire Sur L'Ancien Testament IV, Isäie et Les Douze.
- Jerome. Commentariorum in Michaeam Prophetam, Opera VI. Basle: 1537.
- Kaseman, E. Commentary on Romans. Grand Rapids: 1980.
- Keil, C. F. Biblical Commentary on the Twelve Minor Prophets. Grand Rapids: 1978 (Reprint).
- Lapide, C. Commentaria in Scripturam Sacram. Paris: 1635.
- Lohmeyer, E. Das Evangelium des Matthäus (edited by W. Schmauch). Göttingen: 1962.
- Luther, M. Lectures on the Minor Prophets. St. Louis: 1975.
- Nicholas de Lyra. Postilla Super Totam Bibliam. Nuremberg: 1493.
- Marshall, I. H. The Gospel of Luke. Grand Rapids: 1978.
- Marti, K. Das Dodekapropheten. Tübingen: 1904.
- Mays, J. L. Micah. Philadelphia: 1976.
- Miqr'ot Gedolot. Jerusalem: n.d.
- Mounce, R. The Book of Revelation. Grand Rapids: 1977.
- Nowack, D. W. Die Kleinen Propheten. Göttingen: 1897.
- Plummer, A. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke. Edinburgh: 1900.
- Pococke, E. "A Commentary on Micah," Theological Works, vol. 1. London: 1740.
- Pope, M. Song of Songs. Garden City: 1977.
- Pusey, E. B. The Minor Prophets. Oxford: 1860.
- Ribera, F. Commentariorum. Bresca: 1605.
- Robinson, T. H. Die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten. Tübingen: 1964.
- Rosenmüller, E. F. C. Scholia in Vetas Testamentum. Leipzig: 1977-1835.
- Rudolph, W. Micha-Nahum-Habakuk-Zephania. Gütersloh: 1975.
- Rupert von Deutz. Commentariorum in XII Prophetam Minoram. MPL, vol. 168.
- Sanday, W. and Headlam, A. C. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. Edinburgh: 1902.
- Schlier, H. Der Brief an die Epheser. Düsseldorf: 1957.

- Sellin, E. Das Zwölfpropheten. Leipzig: 1929.
- Smith, G. A. The Book of the Twelve Prophets, 2 vols. London: 1876.
- Smith, J. M. P. (and W. H. Ward and J. H. Bewer). Micah, Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Obadiah, and Joel. Edinburgh: 1911.
- Swete, H. B. Commentary on Revelation. Grand Rapids: 1977 (Reprint).
- Theodore. Theodore Mopsuesteni Commentarius in XII Prophetas (ed. H. N. Sprenger). Weisbaden: 1977.
- Theodoret. Interpretatio Michaeae Prophetae. MPG, vol. 81.
- Theophylakt. Expositio in Prophetam Michaeam. MPG, vol. 126.
- Vuilleumier, R. (and C. Keller). Micheé, Nahoum, Habacuc, Sophonie. Paris: 1971.
- Weiser, A. Das Buch der Zwölf Kleinen Propheten, 2 vols. Göttingen: 1956.
- Wellhausen, J. Die Kleinen Propheten. Berlin: 1898.
- Wildberger, H. Jesaja 1-12. Neukirchen-Vluyn: 1965-72.

B. Monographs and Articles.

- Albrektson, B. "Reflections on the Emergence of a Standard Text of the Hebrew Bible," VT 29 (1978), pp. 49-65.
- Alexander, J. N. S. "The Interpretation of Scripture in the Ante-Nicene Period: a Brief Conspectus," Int 12 (1958), pp. 272-80.
- Allegro, J. M. "Uses of the Semitic Demonstrative Element Z in Hebrew," VI 5 (1955), pp. 309-13.
- Ashby, G. W. Theodoret of Cyrrhus as Exegete of the Old Testament. S. Africa: 1972.
- Bainton, R. H. "The Bible in the Reformation," CHB III, pp. 1-37.
- Barnes, W. E. "On the Influence of the Septuagint on the Peshitta," JTS 2 (1901), pp. 186-197.
- Barr, J. Judaism--Its Continuity with the Bible. Southampton: 1968.
- _____. "St. Jerome's Appreciation of Hebrew," BJRL 49 (1966-67), pp. 37-51.
- Barrett, C. K. "The Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New," CHB I, pp. 377-411.
- Barthélemy, D. Les Devanciers D'Aquila. VT 10 (1963).
- Bate, H. N. "Some Technical Terms of Greek Exegesis," JTS 24 (1922-23), pp. 59-66.

- Baumstark, A. "Die Zitate Des Mt.--Evangeliums aus dem Zwölfprophetenbuch," Bib 37 (1956), pp. 296-313.
- Beyerlin, W. Die Kultradition Israels in der Verkündigung des Propheten Micha. Göttingen: 1959.
- Bickerman, E. "The Septuagint as a Translation," Studies in Jewish and Christian History. Leiden: 1976, pp. 167-200.
- _____. "Some Notes on the Transmission of the Septuagint," Alexander Marx Jubilee Volume (ed. S. Lieberman). N.Y.: 1950, pp. 149-178.
- Black, M. "The Christological Use of the OT in the NT," NTS 18 (1971), pp. 1-14.
- Bloch, J. "The Authorship of the Peshitta," AJSL 35 (1918), pp. 215-22.
- _____. "The Influence of the Greek Bible on the Peshitta," AJSL 36 (1919), pp. 161-66.
- Bloch, R. "Midrash," Approaches to Ancient Judaism: Theory and Practice (ed. W. Green). Missoula: 1978, pp. 29-49.
- Bornkamm, H. Luther and the Old Testament. Philadelphia: 1969.
- Braun, H. "Das Alte Testament im Neuen Testament," ZTK 59 (1962), pp. 16-31.
- Brock, S. P. "The Phenomenon of the Septuagint," OTS 12 (1972), pp. 11-36.
- _____. "Jewish Traditions in Syriac Sources," JJS 30 (1979), pp. 212-32.
- _____. "Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity," Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies 20 (1979), pp. 67-87.
- Brockington, L. H. "Septuagint and Targum," ZAW 66 (1954), pp. 80-86.
- Bruns, J. E. "The Contrasted Women of Apocalypse 12 and 17," CBQ 26 (1964), pp. 459-63.
- Cathcart, K. J. "Notes on Micah 5:4-5," Bib 49 (1968), pp. 511-14.
- Chadwick, H. "The Bible and the Greek Fathers," The Church's Use of the Bible Past and Present (ed. D. Nineham). London: 1963, pp. 25-39.
- Cheyne, T. K. "Micah," Critica Biblica. Amsterdam: 1970, pp. 153-163.
- Childs, B. S. "The Sensus Literalis of Scripture: An Ancient and Modern Problem," Beiträge zur Alttestamentliche Theologie, (ed. H. Donner, et al.). Göttingen: 1977, pp. 80-93.
- Chomsky, W. "The Ambiguity of the Prefixed Prepositions ׀ , 7 , 2 in the Bible," JQR 61 (1970-71), pp. 87-89.
- Churgin, P. Targum Jonathan to the Prophets. New Haven: 1927.

- _____. "The Targum and the Septuagint," AJSL 50 (1933), pp. 41-65.
- Collin, M. "Recherches sur L'histoire Textuelle du Prophète Michée," VT 21 (1971), pp. 281-297.
- Collins, T. Line-forms in Hebrew Poetry. Rome: 1978.
- Crehan, F. J. "The Bible in the Roman Catholic Church from Trent to the Present Day," CHB III, pp. 199-237.
- Daube, D. "Rabbinic Methods of Interpretation and Hellenistic Rhetoric," HUCA 22 (1949), pp. 239-64.
- _____. "Alexandrian Methods of Interpretation and the Rabbis," Hans Lewald Festschrift. Basle: 1953.
- Diestel, L. Geschichte des Alten Testaments in der Christlichen Kirche. Jena: 1869.
- Doeve, J. W. Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts. Assen: 1954.
- Ellis, E. E. "How the New Testament Uses the Old," New Testament Interpretation (ed. I. H. Marshall). Grand Rapids: 1977, pp. 199-219.
- Englander, H. "Joseph Kara's Commentary on Micah in Relation to Rashi's Commentary," HUCA 16 (1941), pp. 157-81.
- Farrar, F. W. History of Interpretation. London: 1886.
- Fitzmyer, J. A. "L^e as a Preposition and Particle in Micah 5:1," CBQ 18 (1956), pp. 10-13.
- France, R. T. "The Formula-Quotations of Mt. 2 and the Problem of Communication," NTS 27 (1981), pp. 233-51.
- Frei, H. W. The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative. New Haven: 1974.
- Fuhs, H. F. The Äthiopische Übersetzung Des Propheten Micha. Bonn: 1968.
- Gehman, H. S. "Some Types of Errors of Transmission in the LXX," VT 3 (1953), pp. 397-400.
- Goldingay, J. "Luther and the Bible," SJT 35 (1982), pp. 33-58.
- Goppelt, L. Typos (2nd Edition). Dormstadt: 1966.
- Goshen-Gottstein, M. H. "Theory and Practice of Textual Criticism: The Text-Critical Use of the LXX," Textus 3 (1963), pp. 130-58.
- Grabois, A. "The Hebraic Veritas and Jewish-Christian Intellectual Relations in the Twelfth Century," Speculum 50 (1975), pp. 613-34.
- Grant, R. M. A Short History of the Interpretation of the Bible. N.Y.: 1963.

- Greenberg, M. "Ancient Versions for Interpreting the Hebrew Text," VTSup 29 (1978), pp. 131-48.
- Gribomont, J. "Latin Versions," IDBSup. Nashville: 1976.
- Grossfeld, B. "Targum," EncJud, pp. 841-51.
- Grossman, A. "Eliezer of Beaugency," EncJud, pp. 630-31.
- Grossouw, W. The Coptic Versions of the Minor Prophets. Rome: 1938.
- Gundry, R. H. The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel. NTSup 18 (1967).
- Hailperin, H. Rashi and the Christian Scholars. Pittsburgh: 1963.
- Hall, B. "Biblical Scholarship: Editions and Commentaries," CHB III, pp. 38-93.
- Hay, D. "Interpretation, History of: NT Interpretation of the OT," IDSUp, pp. 443-446.
- Hruby, K. "Exégèse Rabbinique et Exégèse Patristique," RevScRel 47 (1973), pp. 341-72.
- Jellicoe, S. The LXX and Modern Study. Oxford: 1968.
- Jeppesen, K. "How the Book of Micah Lost Its Integrity," ST 31-33 (1977-79), pp. 101-31.
- _____. "New Aspects of Micah Research," JSOT 8 (1978), pp. 3-32.
- Kelly, J. N. D. "The Bible and the Latin Fathers," The Church's Use of the Bible Past and Present (ed. D. Nineham). London: 1963, pp. 41-56.
- _____. Jerome. London: 1975.
- Kerrigan, A. St. Cyril of Alexandria: Interpreter of the Old Testament. Rome: 1952.
- _____. "The Objects of the Literal and Spiritual Senses of the NT According to St. Cyril of Alexandria," Studia Patristica 1, Berlin: 1957, pp. 354ff.
- Klein, M. L. "Converse Translation: A Targumic Technique," Bib 57 (1976), pp. 515-37.
- Klein, R. Textual Criticism of the Old Testament. Philadelphia: 1974.
- Kraeling, E. G. The Old Testament Since the Reformation. N.Y.: 1955.
- Krobel, K. "Interpretation, History and Principles of," IDB, vol. 2, pp. 718-724.
- Laistner, M. L. W. "Antiochene Exegesis in Western Europe During the Middle Ages," HTR 40 (1947), pp. 19-31.
- LeDéaut, R. "The Current State of Targumic Studies," BTB 3-4 (1973-74), pp. 3-32.

- Lescow, T. "Das Geburtsmotiv in den Messianischen Weissagungen bei Jesaja und Micha," ZAW 79 (1967), pp. 172-207.
- Levey, S. H. "The Date of Targum Jonathan to the Prophets," VT 21 (1971), pp. 186-96.
- Loewe, R. "The 'Plain' Meaning of Scripture in Early Jewish Exegesis," Papers of the Institute of Jewish Studies 1, London: 1964, pp. 140-85.
- _____. "The Jewish Midrashim and Patristic and Scholastic Exegesis of the Bible," Studia Patristica 1, Berlin: 1957, pp. 492-514.
- Long, B. "Notes on the Biblical Use of מְלִיץ טָוֵה," WTJ 41 (1978), pp. 54-67.
- Longnecker, R. Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period. Grand Rapids: 1975.
- Manson, T. W. "The Old Testament in the Teaching of Jesus," BJRL 34 (1951/52), pp. 312-32.
- McKane, W. "The Interpretation of Isaiah VII 14-25," VT 17 (1967), pp. 208-19.
- McNamara, M. "A Century of Targum Study," IBS 1 (1979), pp. 157-68.
- Melamed, E. Z. "The Translation of the LXX to the Book of Micah" (Hebrew), Eshkolot 3 (1959), pp. 90-105.
- _____. Biblical Interpreters (Hebrew), 2 vols. Jerusalem: 1975.
- Metzger, B. "The Practice of Textual Criticism Among the Church Fathers," Studia Patristica XII-XIII (1975), pp. 340-49.
- Meyer, R. "Michabuch," RGG (3rd Edition), vol. 4, cols. 929-31.
- Miller, M. P. "Targum, Midrash, and the Use of the OT in the NT," JSJ 2 (1971), pp. 29-82.
- Muraoka, T. "On the So-called Dativus Ethicus in Hebrew," JTS 29 (1978), pp. 495-98.
- Nolan, B. M. The Royal Son of God: The Christology of Mt. 1-2 in the Setting of the Gospel. Göttingen: 1979.
- Nutt, J. W. (editor). Commentaries on the Later Prophets by R. Eleazer of Beaugenci. I. Isaiah. London: 1879.
- Oberholzer, J. P. "Miga 1:10-16 En Die Septuaginta," Hervormde Teologiese Studies (1973), pp. 74-85.
- Orlinsky, H. M. "The Septuagint as Holy Writ and the Philosophy of the Translators," HUCA 46 (1975), pp. 89-114.
- _____. "The Textual Criticism of the Old Testament," The Bible and The Ancient Near East (ed. G. Wright). Indiana: 1979, pp. 113-32.

- Osborn, E. "Methods and Problems in Patristic Study," USQR 36 (1980), pp. 45-54.
- Pelikan, J. Luther the Expositor. St. Louis: 1959.
- Petuchowski, J. J. "Halakhah in the Church Fathers," Essays in Honor of S. B. Freehof (ed. W. Jacob, et al). 1964.
- Preuss, J. S. From Shadow to Promise. Cambridge, Mass.: 1969.
- Rabin, C. "The Translation Process and the Character of the LXX," Textus 6 (1968), pp. 1-26.
- von Rad, G. Old Testament Theology, vol. 2. N.Y.: 1965.
- Rader, W. The Church and Racial Hostility: A History of Interpretation of Ephesians 2:11-22. Tübingen: 1978.
- Redpath, H. A. "The Geography of the Septuagint," AJT 7 (1903), pp. 289-307.
- Reim, G. Studien Zum Alttestamentlichen Hintergrund Des Johannesevangeliums. Cambridge: 1974.
- Roberts, B. J. The Old Testament Text and Versions. Cardiff: 1951.
- _____. "Old Testament: Manuscripts, Text, and Versions," CHB II, pp. 1-26.
- _____. "The Textual Transmission of the OT," Tradition and Interpretation (ed. G. W. Anderson). Oxford: 1979, pp. 1-30.
- Rosenthal, E. I. J. "Medieval Jewish Exegesis: Its Character and Significance," JSS 9 (1964), pp. 265-81.
- _____. "Rashi and the English Bible," Studia Semitica, vol. 1. Cambridge: 1971, pp. 56-85.
- _____. "Anti-Christian Polemic in Medieval Bible Commentators," Studia Semitica, vol. 1. Cambridge: 1971, pp. 165-85.
- _____. "The Study of the Bible in Medieval Judaism," Studia Semitica, vol. 1. Cambridge: 1971, pp. 244-71.
- Roth, W. M. W. "The Numerical Sequence X/X+1 in the OT," VT 12 (1962), pp. 300-11.
- Salters, R. B. "Possible Variant Readings in a Medieval Hebrew Commentary," JJS 30 (1979), pp. 85-90.
- Sanders, J. A. "Text and Canon: Concepts and Method," JBL 98 (1979), pp. 5-29.
- Schwantes, S. J. "A Note on Micah 5:1," AUSS 1 (1963), pp. 105-07.
- Sebök, M. Die Syrische Uebersetzung des Zwölf Kleinen Propheten. Breslau: 1887

- Shereshevsky, E. "Rashi and the Christian Interpretations," JQR 61 (1970-71), pp. 76-86.
- Smalley, B. The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages. Notre Dame: 1964 (Reprint).
- Soares-Prabhu, G. M. The Formula Quotations in the Infancy Narrative of Matthew. Rome: 1976.
- Stendahl, K. The School of St. Matthew and Its Use of the Old Testament. Philadelphia: 1968.
- Swete, H. B. (Revised by R. R. Ottley). An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek. N.Y.: 1968.
- Taber, R. C. "Translation as Interpretation," Int 32 (1978), pp. 130-43.
- Talmage, F. G. David Kimchi: The Man and the Commentaries. Cambridge, Mass.: 1975.
- Talmon, S. "The Textual Study of the Bible--A New Outlook," Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text (ed. F. M. Cross). Cambridge, Mass.: 1975, pp. 321-400.
- _____. "The Old Testament Text," CHB I, pp. 159-99.
- Taylor, J. The Massoretic Text and the Ancient Versions of the Book of the Book of Micah. London: 1890.
- Thackeray, H. St. J. "The Greek Translators of the Prophetical Books," JTS 4 (1903), pp. 578-85.
- Vermes, G. "The Qumran Interpretation of Scripture in Its Historical Setting," ALUOS 6 (1966-68), pp. 85-97.
- _____. "Interpretation, History of: B. at Qumran and in the Targums," IDBSup (1966), pp. 438-43.
- Voobus, A. "Syriac Versions," IDBSup (1966), pp. 848-54.
- Wevers, J. "Text History and Text Criticism of the Septuagint," VTSup 29 (1978), pp. 392-402.
- Whitley, C. F. "The Hebrew Ephatic Particle 1^e with Pronominal Suffixes," JQR 65 (1974-75), pp. 225-28.
- Wiles, M. F. "Theodore of Mopsuestia as Representative of the Antiochene School," CHB I, pp. 489-510.
- Wilken, R. L. "Judaism in Roman Christian Society," JR 47 (1967), pp. 313-30.
- _____. Judaism and the Early Christian Mind: A Study of Cyril of Alexandria's Exegesis and Theology. New Haven: 1971.
- _____. and Meeks, W. A. Jews and Christians in Antioch in the First Four Centuries of the Common Era. Missoula: 1978.

- Willis, J. T. "Mimmeke lî yese' in Micah 5:1," JQR 58 (1967-68), p. 318.
- _____. "Micah 4:14-5:5: A Unit," VT 18 (1968), pp. 529-47.
- _____. "The Structure of the Book of Micah," SEÅ 34 (1969), pp. 5-42.
- _____. "Fundamental Issues in Contemporary Micah Studies," RestQ 13 (1970), pp. 77-90.
- Würthwein, E. The Text of the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: 1979.
- York, A. D. "The Dating of Targumic Literature," JSJ 5 (1974), pp. 49-62.

C. Unpublished Material.

- Gelles, B. J. Peshat and Derash in Rashi's Commentary on the Bible. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of London: 1975.
- Gordon, R. P. A Study of Targum Jonathan to the Minor Prophets from Nahum to Malachi. Ph.D. Dissertation, Cambridge University.
- Horgan, M. P. Pesharim: Qumran Interpretation of Biblical Books. Ph.D. Dissertation, Fordham University: 1977.
- Salters, R. B. The Book of Ecclesiastes: Text, Versions, and History of Interpretation. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of St. Andrews: 1973.
- Schwantes, S. J. A Critical Study of the Text of Micah. Ph.D. Dissertation, Johns Hopkins University: 1962.
- Willis, J. T. The Structure, Setting, and Interrelationships of the Pericopes in the Book of Micah. Ph.D. Dissertation, Vanderbilt University: 1966.